DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 420 PS 023 138

AUTHOR	Blenkin, G. M.; And Others
TITLE	Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning. Phase One Report [and] Interim Report: Year Two (June 1994 to May 1995).
INSTITUTION	London Univ. (England). Goldsmiths' Coll.
PUB DATE	95
NOTE	247p.; For 1993-1994 reports, see ED 373 870.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Development; Curriculum Development; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Assessment; Educational Attitudes; *Educational Quality; Foreign Countries; Interviews; Longitudinal Studies; Parent Teacher Cooperation; Professional Development; *Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS	Developmentally Appropriate Programs; England; Wales

ABSTRACT

This report presents the main findings of the first phase of an ongoing study on improving the quality of children's early learning in England and Wales. The purpose of the project is to investigate the ways in which early learning in group settings can be improved by raising the quality of the practice of those professionals who work with young children. The first part of the project focused on conducting an extensive survey of existing provisions for young children in England and Wales. In surveying this range of provision, information concerning both the nature and the quality of provision was obtained. The report is divided into three main areas. The first four chapters contain an overview of the project, including a brief summary of the findings, the research methodology adopted, and the mode of analysis. The fifth chapter is the main core of the report and presents, in a detailed and technical form, findings from the survey. Chapter 6 contains an outline of the dissemination process and a discussion of the action research pilot studies which were conducted during the first phase. The concluding chapter identifies the main findings of the research. Copies of the questionnaires used in the study are included in the appendices. The interim report, which is included, presents an introduction, research methodology, analysis, preliminary findings, future plans and conclusions relating to the second phase of the study that involves practitioners in action research, enabling them to investigate and critically reflect upon aspects of their practice. (AA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 420

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Early Childhood Education Research Project

Principles into Practice:

Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning

PHASE ONE REPORT

1995

G.M. Blenkin
V.M. Hurst
M.R. Whitehead
N.Y.L. Yue

A Research Project funded by the Esmée Fairbairn Charitable Trust
at Goldsmiths' College, University of London

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Geva M.
Blenkin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 023138

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREFACE

This report presents the main findings of research conducted during the first phase of a major project. The project, which is designed in three phases, aims to investigate the ways in which early learning in group settings can be improved by raising the quality of the practice of those professionals who work with young children.

During the first phase of the project, a major part of the research activity was directed at conducting an extensive survey of existing provision for young children (from birth to eight years of age) in England and Wales. In surveying this range of provision, the research team has sought to obtain information concerning both the nature and the quality of provision, particularly by exploring such major determinants of quality as the settings in which provision is made, the level of resourcing and the qualifications of those professionals and others who are working with young children. The data have a qualitative dimension in that the survey also set out to elicit the views of practitioners on what might constitute quality of provision for early learning.

The survey has yielded a remarkably rich pool of data, much of which remains to be analysed and reported on in the coming years. However, the main aim of this Phase One Report is to present the quantitative data relating to practitioners' qualifications and training, and the nature of the early years settings. Some qualitative analysis of practitioners' views of those factors which support and constrain a quality curriculum for the early years is also presented.

The report is divided into three main areas. The first four chapters contain an overview of the project, including a brief summary of the findings, the research methodology adopted, and the mode of analysis. The fifth chapter is the main core of the report and presents, in a detailed and technical form, findings from the survey. The concluding chapters contain an outline of the dissemination process and a discussion of the action research pilot studies which were conducted during the first phase.

The report ends with a brief account of the main research activities to be undertaken during the second phase of the project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 1-2

1.1 The Main Aims of the Research 1

1.2 Activities Undertaken in Phase One 1

2 FINDINGS: A BRIEF SUMMARY 3-5

2.1 Findings About the Practitioners Themselves 3

2.2 Findings About the Views of Heads of Institutions Concerning Quality of Provision 3

2.3 Findings from Practitioners' Descriptions of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 4

2.4 Findings from Information Related to the Under-8 Institutions 4

2.5 Related Issues 5

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 6-12

3.1 Questionnaire Survey 6
- 3.1.1 Objectives 6
- 3.1.2 Survey Design and Methodology 6
- 3.1.3 Pilot Study 7
  - 3.1.3.1 Methodology 7
  - 3.1.3.2 Selection of Participants 7
  - 3.1.3.3 Design of Pilot Questionnaire 7
  - 3.1.3.4 Design of Evaluation Questionnaire 7
  - 3.1.3.5 Feedback from Pilot Study 8
- 3.1.4 Main Survey 8
  - 3.1.4.1 Selection of Participants 8
  - 3.1.4.2 Selection of Types of Under-8 Provision 9
  - 3.1.4.3 Identification of Institutions 9
  - 3.1.4.4 Determination of Sample Size 10
  - 3.1.4.5 Main Survey Questionnaire 10

3.2 Structured Interviews: Pilot Studies 11

3.3 Action Research Case Studies: Pilot Exercise 12

4 ANALYSIS 13-14

4.1 Questionnaire Survey 13
4.1.1 Survey Analysis 14

5 FINDINGS 15-155

5.1 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions 15
5.1.1 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision 15
5.1.1.1 Qualifications Held by Heads of Nursery Schools 16
5.1.1.2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Infant/First Schools 17
5.1.1.3 Qualifications Held by Heads of Primary Schools 19
5.1.1.4 Qualifications Held by Heads of Special Schools 19
5.1.1.5 Qualifications Held by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries 21
5.1.1.6 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools 23
5.1.1.7 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools 23
5.1.1.8 Qualifications Held by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries 25
5.1.1.9 Qualifications Held by Leaders of Playgroups 27
5.1.2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 27
5.1.2.1 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 28
5.1.2.2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 30
5.1.3 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in London 31

5.2 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners 33
5.2.1 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision 35
5.2.1.1 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Nursery Schools 35
5.2.1.2 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Infant/First Schools 36
5.2.1.3 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Primary Schools 39
5.2.1.4 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Special Schools 44
5.2.1.5 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Local Authority Day Nurseries 45
5.2.1.6 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Preparatory Schools 48

5.2.1.7 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Nursery Schools.................................. 51
5.2.1.8 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Private and Workplace Nurseries.............................. 54
5.2.1.9 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Playgroups.. 57
5.2.2 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Provisions.. 61
5.2.2.1 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in State-Maintained Provision.. 61
5.2.2.2 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Non-Maintained Provision.. 64
5.2.3 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in London............................ 67

5.3 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained.. 70
5.3.1 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision.................. 71
5.3.1.1 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Nursery Schools were Initially Trained...................... 71
5.3.1.2 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Infant/First Schools were Initially Trained.................. 72
5.3.1.3 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools were Initially Trained...................... 73
5.3.1.4 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools were Initially Trained...................... 76
5.3.1.5 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were Initially Trained.. 77
5.3.1.6 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were Initially Trained.. 78
5.3.1.7 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were Initially Trained...80
5.3.1.8 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were Initially Trained.. 81
5.3.1.9 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Playgroups were Initially Trained............................ 82
5.3.2 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Provisions.. 83
5.3.2.1 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in State-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained.. 84

5.3.2.2 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Non-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained 85
5.3.3 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in London were Initially Trained 86

5.4 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers 89
5.4.1 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision 89
5.4.1.1 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Nursery Schools 89
5.4.1.2 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Infant/First Schools 90
5.4.1.3 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools 90
5.4.1.4 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools 91
5.4.1.5 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Local Authority Day Nurseries 92
5.4.1.6 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools 92
5.4.1.7 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Independent Nursery Schools 92
5.4.1.8 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Private and Workplace Nurseries 93
5.4.1.9 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Playgroups 94
5.4.2 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 95
5.4.2.1 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 95
5.4.2.2 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 95
5.4.3 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in London 96

5.5 Factors that Support the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 97
5.5.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Different Types of Institutions for Under-8s to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 98
5.5.1.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 98
5.5.1.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 99

5.5.1.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 101
5.5.1.4 Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 101
5.5.1.5 Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 103
5.5.1.6 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 105
5.5.1.7 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 106
5.5.1.8 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 108
5.5.1.9 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 108
5.5.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions.............................. 110
5.5.2.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 111
5.5.2.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 112
5.5.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 114

5.6 Factors that Constrain the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 115
5.6.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Different Types of Institutions for Under-8s to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 116

8

5.6.1.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 116
5.6.1.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.......................... 116
5.6.1.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 118
5.6.1.4 Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 119
5.6.1.5 Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.. 120
5.6.1.6 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.. 121
5.6.1.7 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.. 123
5.6.1.8 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.. 124
5.6.1.9 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children.............................. 126
5.6.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions.. 126
5.6.2.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children... 127
5.6.2.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children... 128
5.6.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children... 129

5.7 Factors that are Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8.................. 131
  5.7.1 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners by Heads of Institutions in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision.................. 131
    5.7.1.1 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Nursery Schools.................. 131
    5.7.1.2 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Infant/First Schools.................. 133
    5.7.1.3 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Primary Schools.................. 134
    5.7.1.4 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Special Schools.................. 135
    5.7.1.5 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.................. 137
    5.7.1.6 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools..................137
    5.7.1.7 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools.................. 138
    5.7.1.8 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.................. 140
    5.7.1.9 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Leaders of Playgroups.................. 141
  5.7.2 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions.................. 143
    5.7.2.1 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions.................. 143
    5.7.2.2 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions.................. 144

5.7.3 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Institutions in London 145

5.8 Information Related to Under Eight Institutions 147
    5.8.1 Financial Status of Under-8 Institutions 147
    5.8.2 Sharing of Accommodation in Under-8 Institutions 147
    5.8.3 Children's Accessibility to Outdoor Playspace in Under-8 Institutions 149
    5.8.4 Surrounding Environment of Under-8 Institutions 151
    5.8.5 Proportion of Full-time and Part-time Children in Under-8 Institutions 151
    5.8.6 Proportion of Boys and Girls in Under-8 Institutions 153
    5.8.7 Children with English as a Second Language (ESL) in Under-8 Institutions 153
    5.8.8 Staff (full-time and part-time) to Child Ratio in Under-8 Institutions 155

6 DISSEMINATION ________ 156-158

6.1 Dissemination Through Networks 156
    6.1.1 Dissemination Through Established Agencies 156
    6.1.2 Dissemination Through New Networks 156
6.2 Publication & Reporting 157
    6.2.1 Current Publications 157
    6.2.2 Forthcoming Publications 158
    6.2.3 Press Coverage 158

7 CONCLUSIONS ________ 159

APPENDICES

Appendix A Pilot Questionnaire 160
Appendix B Evaluation Questionnaire Used in the Pilot Study 170
Appendix C Summary of Feedback from Evaluation Questionnaires 174
Appendix D Justification of the Methodology Used in the Determination of the Sample Size for the Survey 179
Appendix E Survey Questionnaire 184
Appendix F Standard Guidelines for Structured Interviews 197
Appendix G Press Release 202

FIGURES

Figure 1 Total Number of Questionnaires Returned from the Main Survey ... 13
Figure 2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions ... 16
Figure 3 Qualifications Held by Heads of Nursery Schools ... 17
Figure 4 Qualifications Held by Heads of Infant/First Schools ... 18
Figure 5 Qualifications Held by Heads of Primary Schools ... 20
Figure 6 Qualifications Held by Heads of Special Schools ... 21
Figure 7 Qualifications Held by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries ... 22
Figure 8 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools ... 24
Figure 9 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools ... 25
Figure 10 Qualifications Held by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries ... 26
Figure 11 Qualifications Held by Leaders of Playgroups ... 28
Figure 12 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions ... 29
Figure 13 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions ... 31
Figure 14 Qualifications Held by Heads of Under-8 Institutions in London ... 32
Figure 15 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners ... 34
Figure 16 Proportion of Practitioners Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges ... 34
Figure 17 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners ... 35
Figure 18 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Nursery Schools ... 37
Figure 19 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Nursery Schools ... 38
Figure 20 Proportion of Practitioners in Nursery Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges ... 38
Figure 21 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Infant/First Schools ... 40
Figure 22 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Infant/First Schools ... 41
Figure 23 Proportion of Practitioners in Infant/First Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges ... 41
Figure 24 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Primary Schools ... 42
Figure 25 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Primary Schools ... 43
Figure 26 Proportion of Practitioners in Primary Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges ... 43
Figure 27 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Special Schools ... 45
Figure 28 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Special Schools ... 46
Figure 29 Proportion of Practitioners in Special Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges ... 46
Figure 30 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Local Authority Day Nurseries ... 48

Figure 31 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Local Authority Day Nurseries 49
Figure 32 Proportion of Practitioners in Local Authority Day Nurseries Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 49
Figure 33 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Preparatory Schools 51
Figure 34 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Preparatory Schools 52
Figure 35 Proportion of Practitioners in Independent Preparatory Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 52
Figure 36 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Nursery Schools 54
Figure 37 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Nursery Schools 55
Figure 38 Proportion of Practitioners in Independent Nursery Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 55
Figure 39 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Private and Workplace Nurseries 57
Figure 40 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Private and Workplace Nurseries 58
Figure 41 Proportion of Practitioners in Private and Workplace Nurseries Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 58
Figure 42 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Playgroups 59
Figure 43 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Playgroups 60
Figure 44 Proportion of Practitioners in Playgroups Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 60
Figure 45 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in State-Maintained Provision 62
Figure 46 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in State-Maintained Provision 63
Figure 47 Proportion of Under-8 Practitioners in State-Maintained Provision Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 63
Figure 48 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Non-Maintained Provision 65
Figure 49 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Non-Maintained Provision 66
Figure 50 Proportion of Under-8 Practitioners in Non-Maintained Provision Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 66
Figure 51 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in London 68
Figure 52 Proportion of Under-8 Practitioners in London Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges 69

Figure 53 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners in London 69
Figure 54 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained 70
Figure 55 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 71
Figure 56 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Nursery Schools were Initially Trained 72
Figure 57 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Nursery Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 73
Figure 58 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Infant/First Schools were Initially Trained
Figure 59 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Infant/First Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 74
Figure 60 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools were Initially Trained 75
Figure 61 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 75
Figure 62 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools were Initially Trained 76
Figure 63 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 77
Figure 64 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were Initially Trained 78
Figure 65 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 78
Figure 66 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were Initially Trained 79
Figure 67 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 80
Figure 68 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were Initially Trained 81
Figure 69 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 81
Figure 70 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were Initially Trained 82
Figure 71 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 83
Figure 72 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Playgroups were Initially Trained 84

Figure 73 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Playgroups were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 84
Figure 74 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in State-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained 85
Figure 75 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in State-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 86
Figure 76 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Non-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained 87
Figure 77 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Non-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 87
Figure 78 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in London were Initially Trained 88
Figure 79 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in London were Initially Trained through Specific Courses 88
Figure 80 Proportion of Qualified Teachers who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 89
Figure 81 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Nursery Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 90
Figure 82 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Infant/First Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 90
Figure 83 Proportion of Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 91
Figure 84 Proportion of Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 91
Figure 85 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Local Authority Day Nurseries who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 92
Figure 86 Proportion of Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 93
Figure 87 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Independent Nursery Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 93
Figure 88 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Private and Workplace Nurseries who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 94
Figure 89 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Playgroups who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 94
Figure 90 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education 95

Figure 91 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education........ 96
Figure 92 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in London who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education........ 96
Figure 93 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 97
Figure 94 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 99
Figure 95 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 100
Figure 96 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 102
Figure 97 Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 103
Figure 98 Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 104
Figure 99 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 106
Figure 100 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 107
Figure 101 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 109
Figure 102 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 110
Figure 103 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 112
Figure 104 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 113
Figure 105 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 114
Figure 106 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children........ 115

Figure 107 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 117

Figure 108 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 118

Figure 109 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 119

Figure 110 Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 121

Figure 111 Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 122

Figure 112 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 123

Figure 113 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 124

Figure 114 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 125

Figure 115 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 127

Figure 116 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 128

Figure 117 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 129

Figure 118 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children 130

Figure 119 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions 132

Figure 120 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Nursery Schools 133

Figure 121 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Infant/First Schools 134

Figure 122 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Primary Schools 135

Figure 123 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Special Schools 136
Figure 124 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries 138
Figure 125 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools 139
Figure 126 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools 140
Figure 127 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries 141
Figure 128 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Leaders of Playgroups 142
Figure 129 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 144
Figure 130 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions 145
Figure 131 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in London 146
Figure 132 Financial Status of Under-8 Institutions 148
Figure 133 Sharing of Accommodation in Under-8 Institutions 149
Figure 134 Children's Accessibility to Outdoor Playspace in Under-8 Institutions 150
Figure 135 Surrounding Environment of Under-8 Institutions 152
Figure 136 Proportion of Full-time and Part-time Children in Under-8 Institutions 153
Figure 137 Proportion of Boys and Girls in Under-8 Institutions 154
Figure 138 Proportion of Children with ESL in Under-8 Institutions 154
Figure 139 Staff to Child Ratio in Under-8 Institutions 155

1 INTRODUCTION

The research, Phase One of which is reported below, was undertaken as a contribution to the extensive programme of surveys and studies which is currently being mounted world-wide into the principles and the practice of early education.

Research already well established, such as that of the High Scope project in the USA, has underlined the importance of a sound start for children, in relation not only to their subsequent educational progress but also to their development as responsible citizens. And the significance of these findings has been recognised in current proposals and recommendations, most notably perhaps those of the Report of the Commission on Education and of the Report of the Royal Society of Arts, for enhanced provision in this sector.

The findings and these subsequent recommendations, however, have stressed that it is not merely the provision of early education which is important; it is the **quality** of that provision which is crucial. And so, the central task which this research project has addressed is to investigate the related questions of what is the quality of current provision in England and Wales and what is regarded as constituting high quality provision for the early years.

The Report of Phase One of the project which follows is a detailed technical report for the research community and it extends the analysis of the material first presented in the Interim Report (Blenkin, G.M. and Yue, N.Y.L. (1994) *"Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning (Year One: June 1993 - May 1994) Interim Report: March 1994"* on the ERIC database).

This analysis is being re-formulated for a wider audience of practitioners, policy-makers and trainers and will be published in book form by Paul Chapman Publishing, London.

1.1 THE MAIN AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

The main aims of the research are:

- ***to identify key aspects of professional ability which are crucial to the quality of children's learning***
- ***to generate criteria for promoting the development of these aspects of professional ability***
- ***to generate consequent criteria for improving professional practice in the early years***

1.2 ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN PHASE ONE

In the first phase of the study, the major activity has been an extensive survey of existing provision for early years (0-8) education in England and Wales.

19

While recognizing the important differences in the legal requirements for provision for children from 0-5 and those from (rising) 5-8, the survey has included all forms of provision for children from 0-8 in group settings, whether these are state-maintained, independent or voluntary.

In reviewing this range of provision, the survey has sought to obtain information concerning both the nature and the quality of provision, particularly by exploring such major determinants of quality as the settings in which provision is made, the level of resourcing and the qualifications of those professionals and others who are working with young children.

The survey has also had a qualitative dimension, however, since it has set out not only to obtain quantitative data concerning what the current provision is, but also to elicit the views of those directly involved in education in the early years concerning what might constitute quality of provision. This has been done in the hope that some kind of consensus view might emerge of a kind which might be strong enough to transcend any charge of subjectivism in relation to an issue where individual judgment must inevitably play a major part. The identification of aspects of quality regarded as crucial by a significant proportion of professionals must go some way towards offsetting this kind of subjectivity.

This qualitative dimension has been reinforced by a series of structured interviews conducted by members of the research team with the professionals in charge of a number of group settings for early childhood provision in the London area. These structured interviews have again been designed to elicit judgments concerning the essential elements of high quality provision.

Finally, a series of action research case studies have been undertaken in several group settings in the London area. These have involved members of the team, and several other colleagues, working closely with practitioners and jointly evaluating their practices, their achievements and their difficulties.

The survey has yielded a remarkably rich pool of data, much of which remains to be analysed and reported on in the coming years. However, the main aim of this Phase One Report is to present an analysis of the quantitative data relating to practitioners' qualifications and training and the nature of the early years settings. Some qualitative analysis of practitioners' views of what supports and constrains a quality curriculum for the early years is also presented here. Further analysis of their views on what constitutes a quality curriculum is being undertaken during Phase Two of the project and will be presented alongside the main action research reports in Phase Two.

It is hoped that during the Third Phase of our project the narratives elicited from the many practitioners who have cooperated with us will be subjected to a more sophisticated analysis. We have identified three main sources for these narratives of early years practice: the national survey (Phase One), the structured interviews (Phases One and Two), and the action research evidence (Phases One, Two and Three). This substantial body of data will be analysed with the aid of innovative computer assisted qualitative analysis software.

The action research dimension of the study must now begin to move towards centre-stage, since it is through this activity that we hope to discover strategies for translating the principles derived from our investigations of quality into the realities of professional practice, in order to raise the quality of that practice.

2 FINDINGS: A BRIEF SUMMARY

2.1 FINDINGS ABOUT THE PRACTITIONERS THEMSELVES

- Less than a fifth of all practitioners who are working with children under eight years of age in group settings have a first degree. Just over a tenth have no qualifications at all.

- Over two-fifths of teachers who are heads of institutions that cater for young children hold a Certificate of Education and a quarter of these qualified before 1960 with a two year Certificate.

- Over half of practitioners who are working with under-8s were trained as qualified teachers.

- However, only a quarter of these qualified teachers working with under-8s were initially trained for the 3-8 age phase, of which only a third were initially trained to work with 3-5 year olds.

- Nearly two-thirds of teachers working in the early years, therefore, have had no specific initial training for working with children under five years of age.

- Regardless of the age related experience of their initial training, only a sixth of teachers working in the early years have engaged in further study related to early childhood education.

- The majority of heads of institutions, whether they are playgroup leaders or run private nurseries or are working as headteachers, do not upgrade their qualifications once they have acquired the minimum professional qualification for the job.

2.2 FINDINGS ABOUT THE VIEWS OF HEADS OF INSTITUTIONS CONCERNING QUALITY OF PROVISION

- The majority of heads of every type of group setting, whether located in the voluntary or independent or state-maintained sector ranked *"Knowledge of Child Development"* as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners who work with the under-8s.

- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"* was placed relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners, even by the heads of schools for statutory age children e.g. state-maintained Primary and Infant schools, and preparatory schools in the private sector.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Children"*, *"Organisational Skills"* and *"Partnership with Parents"* were ranked as highly significant in the professional development of practitioners by heads. In-service training of all kinds, by contrast, was ranked low.

- *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* was considered to be the most constraining factor on the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by the majority of heads in all types of provision except state-maintained Nursery Schools. Headteachers of Nursery Schools cited *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* as the most constraining factor.

- *"The Qualities of Staff"*, *"Effective Partnership with Parents"* and *"The Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children. *"A High Ratio of Staff to Children"* was also seen as very significant by playgroup leaders and by heads of nurseries in the independent sector.

2.3 FINDINGS FROM PRACTITIONERS' DESCRIPTIONS OF AN APPROPRIATE CURRICULUM FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

- Early analysis of the description of a quality curriculum reveals a remarkable consensus among practitioners.

- Practitioners advocate a broad curriculum for young children which draws upon real life experiences.

- Practitioners emphasize the importance of the social curriculum and the personal ethos of early education.

- Most practitioners claimed that a high quality curriculum requires high quality and professionally trained practitioners.

- The majority of practitioners express serious concern about the negative effects of a narrow and subject-based curriculum on children's early learning.

2.4 FINDINGS FROM INFORMATION RELATED TO UNDER-8 INSTITUTIONS

- Over half of all under-8 institutions are funded by their Local Authorities. These include all the Nursery Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries, nearly all Infant Schools and Special Schools, the vast majority of Primary Schools, and a very small proportion of Playgroups.

- Just over a fifth of all under-8 institutions shared their accommodation.

- Children have access to outdoor playspace in nearly all types of under-8 provision, with those from over two-thirds of under-8 institutions having continuous access to outdoor playspace.

- More than one in four under-8 institutions who responded to the questionnaire survey are in suburban areas. Another two-fifths are in inner cities, with a further two-fifths in urban areas.

- More than half the children in under-8 institutions are full-time.

- The proportion of boys and girls in all under-8 provisions are approximately equal. However, nearly two-thirds of children in Special Schools are boys.

- Over a tenth of children in under-8 institutions do not have English as their mother tongue.

- The average number of children per member of staff in all under-8 provisions is nine.

2.5 RELATED ISSUES

- Difficulties were encountered in identifying the type of provision to be surveyed. Sometimes this was because a range of different names were used in different geographical regions to describe the same category, e.g. Local Authority Day Nurseries had twelve alternative names. Sometimes the provisions had been incorrectly categorised by the local authorities, e.g. Playgroups were often described as Private Nurseries.

- Similar difficulties were identified in naming professionals who work with under-5s, e.g. practitioners were often called teachers although they did not have QT status.

- There was a high level of refusals in the survey. Reasons given were usually that the head was overworked or too busy. This level of refusal, however, did not significantly affect the validity of the survey findings.

- A significant number of Playgroups and Private Nurseries could not be traced by the Post Office although up-to-date lists were used for the sample.

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There have been three main dimensions of the research in Phase One:

- a questionnaire survey
- structured interviews
- action research case studies.

3.1 QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

The questionnaire survey constituted the main part of the research in phase one. In this section, the objectives, procedures and methodology used in the survey will be outlined.

3.1.1 Objectives

The main objectives of the questionnaire survey were:

- *to elicit information on the nature and qualifications of practitioners working with children under-8*

- *to identify key factors or criteria that support the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children*

- *to identify key factors or criteria that constrain the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children*

- *to identify key factors that are influential in the professional development of practitioners working with young children*

- *to obtain the views of practitioners concerning what constitutes a quality curriculum for young children*

- *to obtain practitioners' suggestions for improvements in the current educational provision for under-8s*

- *to obtain practitioners' suggestions for improvements in professional training and development for practitioners who work with young children*

3.1.2 Survey Design and Methodology

Our targeted respondents were from a cross-section of institutions/groups and ranged from headteachers in schools to leaders of Playgroups. We needed a questionnaire, therefore, which while being appropriately wide-ranging, would not create any major difficulties for the respondents. To ensure this, it was decided to pilot-test the questionnaire and invite evaluation of it before the main survey was undertaken.

The questionnaire survey, therefore, consisted of two phases:

- Pilot Exercise
- Main Survey

3.1.3 Pilot Study

The purpose of the pilot exercise was firstly to determine areas in the questionnaire which might need changes or attention in order to ensure that subjects in the main study would experience no difficulties in completing it. Secondly the exercise would enable us to carry out a preliminary analysis to see whether the wording and format of the questions would present any difficulties when the main data were analysed.

3.1.3.1 Methodology

A questionnaire and an evaluation form were sent to each of the selected participants. Participants were requested to complete both the questionnaire and evaluation form. Feedback obtained from the evaluation forms was carefully analysed and used in the final questionnaire design for the main survey.

3.1.3.2 Selection of Participants

The participants of the pilot exercise were selected carefully to ensure that we would obtain a cross section of opinions and comments from practitioners working in all forms of under-8 provision. At least one participant from each type of provision was selected.

3.1.3.3 Design of Pilot Questionnaire

The main structure of the pilot questionnaire was designed to elicit effectively all information as set out in the main objectives of the survey (see section 3.1.1).

It was structured into three main sections (Appendix A):

I Information related to the institution
II Number and qualifications of staff
III Planning for early learning

3.1.3.4 Design of Evaluation Questionnaire

The objective of the evaluation questionnaire was to identify any potential problems that might be encountered by the respondent, and to find out if any changes or alterations to the questionnaire were required.

The following information was to be elicited from the evaluation questionnaire (Appendix B):

- Time taken by the respondent to complete the questionnaire
- Comment on whether the instructions on the questionnaire were clear and easy to follow
- Comment on the appearance and general layout of the questionnaire
- Unclear or ambiguous questions

- Difficulties in answering any of the questions
- Objections to answering any of the questions
- Omission of any major topic or question
- Any further comments on the questionnaire

3.1.3.5 Feedback from Pilot Study

Seventeen sets of pilot questionnaires and evaluation forms were sent out to the selected participants in July 1993. Ten evaluation forms were returned and carefully analysed to incorporate any changes and suggestions made into the main survey questionnaire. A summary of feedback, including comments and suggestions, may be found in Appendix C.

3.1.4 Main Survey

The main distribution of the questionnaire survey was scheduled to take place in late September 1993 after the school term had begun.

3.1.4.1 Selection of Participants

The subjects of our main survey were selected from two main areas:

(i) All the Local Authorities in London
(ii) Selected Counties and Cities in England & Wales

The selected geographical locations for the questionnaire survey are shown below:

London Boroughs

Barking & Dagenham
Barnet
Bexley
Brent
Bromley
Camden
City of London
Croydon
Ealing
Enfield
Greenwich
Hackney
Hammersmith & Fulham
Haringey
Harrow
Havering
Hillingdon
Hounslow
Islington
Kensington & Chelsea
Kingston-Upon-Thames
Lambeth
Lewisham
Merton
Newham
Redbridge
Richmond
Southwark
Sutton
Tower Hamlets
Waltham Forest
Wandsworth
Westminster

Selected Counties and Cities in England & Wales

Berkshire
Buckinghamshire
Cambridgeshire
Devon
Gwynedd
Hampshire
Humberside
Isle of Man
Isle of Wight
Kent
Kirklees
Liverpool
Manchester
Norfolk
North Tyneside
North Yorkshire
Nottinghamshire
South Glamorgan
Wolverhampton

3.1.4.2 Selection of Types of Under-8 Provision

The following shows the types of Under-8 provision involved in the questionnaire survey

State-Maintained Provision

Nursery Schools
Infant and First Schools
Primary Schools
Special Schools and Units
Local Authority Day Nurseries

Non-Maintained Provision

Independent Preparatory Schools
Independent Nursery Schools
Private and Workplace Nurseries
Playgroups

3.1.4.3 Identification of Institutions

Information for all types of under-8 provision in our selected areas was requested and obtained from their respective Local Education Authority. Each type of provision was separated into the categories listed above.

Difficulties were encountered during the identification of Local Authority Day Nurseries. It was found that different names are used to represent these Local Authority Day Nurseries. The following is a list of the names used:

Day Nursery
Children's Centre
Young Children's Centre
Family Centre
Under 5s Centre
Under 8s Centre
Day Centre
Nursery Centre
Under 5s Resource Centre
Under 5s Education Centre (UFEC)
Early Years Centre
Childcare Centre

In addition, difficulties were experienced in the gathering of information about non-educational forms of under-8 provision, as some authorities would not release the names and addresses of these establishments.

3.1.4.4 Determination of Sample Size

The sample size for the questionnaire survey was determined according to the total population for each type of under-8 provision and the funding available. The latter was crucial in determining the survey sample size.

The methodology used in selecting the survey sample is known as two-stage cluster sampling with unequal cluster sizes (a simple random sample of education authorities, and a simple random sample of under-8 provision under each of the selected authorities). A justification of the methodology used in determining the required sample size for the survey is given in Appendix D.

A total random sample size of 2420 educational and non-educational establishments representing all forms of under-8 provision was chosen for the main survey. This included all the under-8 provision in the London Boroughs of Bromley and Lewisham which it was decided should be surveyed in full.

3.1.4.5 Main Survey Questionnaire

The pilot questionnaire was slightly revised to form the main survey questionnaire which was structured into three main sections to elicit the required information:

Part I : Information Related to the Institution

Information to be elicited included:

- *the type of institution/group;*
- *the status of the institution/group;*
- *whether the institution shares accommodation with other institution(s)/group(s);*
- *the surrounding environment of the institution;*
- *the children's access to outdoor play space;*
- *the number of full-time and part-time children in each early years age group;*
- *the gender of the children in each age group; and*
- *the number of children with English as a second language in each age group.*

Part II : Number & Qualifications of Staff

Information to be elicited included:

- *the qualification(s) of the respondent;*
- *the number of full-time and part-time staff who work with children under-8;*
- *the qualifications and roles of other staff members who work closely with children under-8;*
- *the number of staff who have more than one qualification;*
- *the number of staff who have re-trained to work with children under-8 in the early years age range;*
- *the age ranges for which qualified teachers were initially trained; and*
- *the number of staff who are qualified teachers and have engaged in further study related to early childhood.*

Part III : The Quality of Early Learning

Information to be elicited included:

- *factors that support the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children;*
- *factors that constrain the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children;*
- *factors that are influential in the professional development of practitioners working with children under eight;*
- *the respondent's description of a quality curriculum for young children;*
- *the respondent's suggestions for improvements in the current educational provision for under-8s; and*
- *the respondent's suggestions for improvements in professional training and development for practitioners who work with young children.*

The final version of the questionnaire sent to all selected participants is given in Appendix E.

3.2 STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS: PILOT STUDIES

This dimension of the research is designed to explore in depth, and by a different research technique, the issues of quality which are a major concern of the study, and to complement the evidence derived from those questions on the survey questionnaire which are directed at eliciting comments on these issues.

The level of funding for the project in its first phase was not such as to make it possible to mount this form of research on the scale originally envisaged. In particular, because of the need to maintain a level of sampling for the main survey by questionnaire which would ensure validity of the data, it was not possible to appoint the research assistant needed to support this work on the scale originally planned.

However, some work has been undertaken in a pilot form, and this has involved structured interviews conducted by the members of the team with the heads of eleven centres in the London area. These interviews, which are audiotaped, are all conducted in accordance with agreed standard guidelines, which have been framed to complement relevant questions on the survey questionnaire (Appendix F).

The texts of these interviews have been transcribed. And responses to question 10 of the structured interviews, "How would you describe a quality curriculum for young children?", are being analysed as narratives and compared with the written responses to question 19 of the survey questionnaire which is identically worded.

This pilot exercise is also enabling us to compare modes of analysis to determine the most appropriate and productive form for this kind of exploration.

3.3 ACTION RESEARCH CASE STUDIES: PILOT EXERCISE

Action research has been undertaken with practitioners in eleven group settings in the London area as follows:

3	State-Maintained Primary Schools (mixed 3-11 year olds)
2	State-Maintained Infant Schools (mixed 3-7 year olds)
1	Independent Preparatory School (single sex 6-12 year old boys, with a mixed nursery, 3-6 year olds)
2	State-Maintained Nursery Schools (mixed 3-5 year olds)
2	State-Maintained Combined Centres for Under-5s (mixed 1-5 year olds)
1	Independent Workplace Nursery (mixed 9 months - 4 year olds)

These pilot studies began from an assumption that if we are to develop the quality of the curriculum for young children then we must have reflective practitioners. The project team is seeking to test this assumption by undertaking action research with practitioners and evaluating the effect that reflection has on both the quality and the development of practice and provision.

All the practitioners involved in the pilot studies chose their own curriculum issue to investigate and reflect upon (e.g. early representation and cognitive development, managing staff contact with children). Although each issue is different, they were all selected as examples that illustrate the important link between principles and practice. In short, each practitioner, with the help of a research team member, was researching into his/her effectiveness in putting the principles into practice.

The practitioners were in control of the investigation and the action research process. The research team member was available to help in the processes of:

- gathering evidence
- reflecting on practice
- linking thought to action
- evaluating evidence
- reporting the action research

The practitioners also evaluated the effect of the action research process on the quality of the experiences that were provided for their children. For an important thesis to be tested is whether the quality of provision can be raised by promoting a capability for reflective self-evaluation in practitioners.

4 ANALYSIS

4.1 QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

In total 548 questionnaires were returned by the end of December 1993, representing just under a quarter of the total number of questionnaires sent out initially. Figure 1 gives a breakdown of the total number of questionnaires returned from each of the selected forms of under-8 provision.

Total Number of Questionnaires Sent = 2420

Type of Provision	Total Returned from London	Total Returned from the Counties	Total Returned	Percentage of Total Sent
Nursery Schools	43	47	90	49 %
Infant/First Schools	26	47	73	45 %
Primary Schools	42	46	88	23 %
Special Schools	24	26	60	21 %
Local Authority Day Nurseries	17	4	21	12 %
Independent Preparatory Schools	27	34	61	20 %
Independent Nursery Schools	10	14	24	37 %
Private/Workplace Nurseries	25	11	36	12 %
Playgroups	59	36	95	22 %
Sum of All Provisions	273	275	548	23 %

Figure 1 Total Number of Questionnaires Returned from the Main Survey

All returned questionnaires were sorted into their respective categories of under-8 provision for the London Boroughs and the Counties. Special codings were assigned to all returned questionnaires for easy identification and reference. Summary sheets were designed for each question to record the information elicited from the completed questionnaires. These were then transferred onto the computer for statistical analysis.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4.1.1 Survey Analysis

Statistical analysis has been performed on all quantitative data elicited from each of the three main parts of the questionnaire as detailed below:

Part I: Information Related to the Institution

The financial status of the institution
Whether the institution has private or shared accommodation
The surrounding environment of the institution
The children's access to outdoor play space
The style of children's access to outdoor play space
Number of full-time and part-time children in each age group
Number of boys and girls in each age group
Number of children with ESL in each age group
Staff to child ratio for each form of under-8 provision
Staff to child ratio for state-maintained provision
Staff to child ratio for non-maintained provision
Staff to child ratio for all forms of provision in London

Part II: Number and Qualifications of Staff

The qualifications of heads of institution and other practitioners working closely with children under 8.

The qualifications of heads and staff will be analysed in relation to the following variables:

- staff in all forms of provision
- staff in maintained provision
- staff in non-maintained provision
- staff in London Boroughs
- number, type and level of qualification(s) held
- staff with specific early years qualifications
- engagement in further study after initial qualification
- staff in different forms of provision

Part III: The Quality of Early Learning

Factors considered to be most significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions in the following categories:

- maintained provision
- non-maintained provision
- London Boroughs
- different forms of provision

Factors considered to be most significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions in the same categories.

Factors considered to be influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in the same categories.

5 FINDINGS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

This chapter presents the major findings from the questionnaire survey.

5.1 QUALIFICATIONS HELD BY HEADS OF INSTITUTIONS (Figure 2)

- Just over two-fifths (42.1 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which a quarter (24.7 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Under two-fifths (37.4 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions have first degrees, of which just over half (51.3 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- Under a tenth (9 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions were qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Under a fifth (18.3 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Just over a tenth (12.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions have higher degree qualifications, of which the vast majority (88.8 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Less than a third (28.4 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Approximately a third (31.8 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions have other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Special Needs, Diploma in Education, Certificate in Special Education etc.).

- Over half (57.6 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions have more than one qualification.

5.1.1 Qualifications Held by Head of Institutions in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision

The remaining sections under 5.1 report on a refinement of the findings on the qualifications held by heads of institutions for under-8s. Findings are reported in relation to heads of each type of provision surveyed, in relation to heads of institutions in the state-maintained sector, in relation to heads of institutions in the non-maintained sector and in relation to heads of institutions in the London area.

N=536	
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	19.2%
BA	14.9%
BSc	3.3%
NNEB/City & Guilds	18.3%
SRN	1.0%
PGCE	9.0%
NVQs	0.8%
BTech	0.6%
MA/MEd/MAdd	11.1%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	10.4%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	31.7%
Montessori Certificate	5.2%
PPA Short Courses	13.0%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	10.5%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	1.2%
PPA Further Course	3.7%
MPhil/PhD	1.4%
None	0.4%
Others	31.8%
More than one qualification	57.6%

Figure 2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions

5.1.1.1 Qualifications Held by Heads of Nursery Schools (Figure 3)

- Seven out of ten (70 percent) practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which nearly a sixth (15.9 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Two fifths (40 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools have first degrees, of which just over half (52.8 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- One in ten (10 percent) practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Just over a tenth (12.2 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Only one in twenty-five (4.4 percent) practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools has higher degree qualifications, of which all have Masters' degrees.

- Just over one in twenty (5.5 percent) practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Approximately one in three (32.2 percent) practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools has other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Diploma in Child Development, Diploma in Nursery Education etc.).

- Just over half (51.1 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Nursery Schools have more than one qualification.

N=90

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	21.1%
BA	16.7%
BSc	2.2%
NNEB/City & Guilds	12.2%
SRN	-
PGCE	10.0%
NVQs	-
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	4.4%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	11.1%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	58.9%
Montessori Certificate	-
PPA Short Courses	4.4%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	1.1%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-
PPA Further Course	-
MPhil/PhD	-
None	-
Others	32.2%
More than one qualification	51.1%

Figure 3 Qualifications Held by Heads of Nursery Schools

5.1.1.2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Infant/First Schools (Figure 4)

- Seven out of ten (70.4 percent) practitioners who are heads of Infant/First Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which over a quarter (28 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Nearly half (49.3 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Infant/First Schools have first degrees, of which just over two-thirds (68.6 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- Only one in twenty-five (4.2 percent) practitioners who are heads of Infant/First Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Just one in six (16.9 percent) practitioners who are heads of Infant/First Schools has higher degree qualifications, of which all have Masters' degrees.

- Only one in thirty-five (2.8 percent) practitioners who are heads of Infant/First Schools has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Approximately one in three (29.6 percent) practitioners who are heads of Infant/First Schools has other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Certificate in Early Years, Diploma in Child Development etc.).

- Nearly half (49.3 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Infant/First Schools have more than one qualification.

N=71	
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	33.8%
BA	15.5%
BSc	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	-
SRN	-
PGCE	4.2%
NVQs	1.4%
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	16.9%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	19.7%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	50.7%
Montessori Certificate	-
PPA Short Courses	1.4%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-
PPA Further Course	1.4%
MPhil/PhD	-
None	-
Others	29.6%
More than one qualification	49.3%

Figure 4 Qualifications Held by Heads of Infant/First Schools

5.1.1.3 **Qualifications Held by Heads of Primary Schools** (Figure 5)

- More than six out of ten (63.7 percent) practitioners who are heads of Primary Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, and one in seven (14.3 percent) of these was qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Under two-thirds (63.7 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Primary Schools have first degrees, of which just over two-thirds (67.8 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- About one in ten (11.4 percent) practitioners who are heads of Primary Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Just over one in five (21.6 percent) practitioners who are heads of Primary Schools have higher degree qualifications, of which the vast majority (89.4 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Less than one in forty (2.3 percent) practitioners who are heads of Primary Schools has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Under a quarter (23.9 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Primary Schools have other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Certificate in Early Years, Teacher's Certificate etc.).

- Nearly two-thir[illegible]3.6 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Primary Schools have more than one qualification.

5.1.1.4 **Qualifications Held by Heads of Special Schools** (Figure 6)

- Over half (58.6 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Special Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which just under a quarter (23.5 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Six out of ten (60.3 percent) practitioners who are heads of Special Schools have first degrees, and just over half (51.4 percent) of these were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- Just over a fifth (22.4 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Special Schools were qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Less than one in fifty (1.7 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Special Schools was qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

N=88

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	43.2%
BA	17.1%
BSc	3.4%
NNEB/City & Guilds	-
SRN	-
PGCE	11.4%
NVQs	1.1%
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	19.3%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	9.1%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	54.6%
Montessori Certificate	-
PPA Short Courses	2.3%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-
PPA Further Course	-
MPhil/PhD	2.3%
None	-
Others	23.9%
More than one qualification	63.6%

Figure 5 Qualifications Held by Heads of Primary Schools

- About three out of ten (29.3 percent) practitioners who are heads of Special Schools have higher degree qualifications, of which nearly all (94.2 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Less than one in fifty (1.7 percent) practitioners who are heads of Special Schools has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Over half (56.9 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Special Schools have other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Special Needs, Certificate in Special Education, Diploma in Education etc.).

- Approximately four out of five (82.8 percent) practitioners who are heads of Special Schools have more than one qualification.

N=58

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	31.0%
BA	22.4%
BSc	6.9%
NNEB/City & Guilds	1.7%
SRN	-
PGCE	22.4%
NVQs	-
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	27.6%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	13.8%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	44.8%
Montessori Certificate	-
PPA Short Courses	1.7%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-
PPA Further Course	-
MPhil/PhD	1.7%
None	-
Others	56.9%
More than one qualification	82.8%

Figure 6 Qualifications Held by Heads of Special Schools

5.1.1.5 Qualifications Held by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries (Figure 7)

- Approximately one in seven (15 percent) practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries was qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which a third (33.3 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- A quarter (25 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries have first degrees, of which six out of ten (60 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- One in twenty (5 percent) practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Over half (55 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Only one in twenty (5 percent) practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries has higher degree qualifications, of which all have Masters' degrees.

- Three out of ten (30 percent) practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- More than two-fifths (45 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries have other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Certificate in Social Services, Diploma in Child Development etc.).

- More than half (55 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries have more than one qualification.

N=20

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	15.0%
BA	10.0%
BSc	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	55.0%
SRN	-
PGCE	5.0%
NVQs	-
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	5.0%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	5.0%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	10.0%
Montessori Certificate	-
PPA Short Courses	15.0%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	5.0%
PPA Further Course	10.0%
MPhil/PhD	-
None	-
Others	45.0%
More than one qualification	55.0%

Figure 7 — Qualifications Held by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries

5.1.1.6 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools (Figure 8)

- Just under half (47.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which under a fifth (17.9 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Over half (57.7 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools have first degrees, of which just over a quarter (26.5 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- About one in ten (10.2 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Just one in thirty (3.4 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools was qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Less than one in five (18.7 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools has higher degree qualifications, of which just over four-fifths (81.8 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Approximately one in twenty (5.1 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools was qualified by way of a Montessori Certificate.

- About one in thirty (3.4 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools has no qualification at all.

- Around a quarter (25.4 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools have other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Certificate in Further Professional Study, Diploma in Advanced Education etc.).

- Just over half (50.9 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Preparatory Schools have more than one qualification.

5.1.1.7 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools (Figure 9)

- Less than two-fifths (39.1 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which two-thirds (66.8 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Just over a quarter (26 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools have first degrees, and just one in six (16.5 percent) of these was qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- More than a tenth (13 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools were qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

N=59	
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	15.3%
BA	27.1%
BSc	15.3%
NNEB/City & Guilds	3.4%
SRN	-
PGCE	10.2%
NVQs	-
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	15.3%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	8.5%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	39.0%
Montessori Certificate	5.1%
PPA Short Courses	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-
PPA Further Course	-
MPhil/PhD	3.4%
None	3.4%
Others	25.4%
More than one qualification	50.9%

Figure 8 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools

- Just over a quarter (26.1 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Only one in twenty-five (4.3 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools has higher degree qualifications, of which all have Masters' degrees.

- Three out of ten (30.4 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Three out of ten (30.4 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools were qualified by way of a Montessori Certificate.

- Just over a fifth (21.7 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools have other qualifications (e.g. Advanced Diploma in Education, Certificate in Social Care, Certificate in Educational Psychology etc.).

- More than two out of five (43.5 percent) practitioners who are heads of Independent Nursery Schools have more than one qualification.

N=23	
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	4.3%
BA	21.7%
BSc	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	26.1%
SRN	-
PGCE	13.0%
NVQs	-
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	4.3%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	26.1%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	13.0%
Montessori Certificate	30.4%
PPA Short Courses	17.4%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	13.0%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-
PPA Further Course	-
MPhil/PhD	-
None	-
Others	21.7%
More than one qualification	43.5%

Figure 9 Qualifications Held by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools

5.1.1.8 Qualifications Held by Heads of Private & Workplace Nurseries (Figure 10)

- Only approximately one in ten (11.1 percent) practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries was qualified through a Certificate of Education, and all of these were qualified after 1960 with a three year certificate.

- Just over one in twenty (5.6 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries have first degrees, and all of these were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- Only one in thirty-five (2.8 percent) practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Half (50 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further one in six (16.7 percent) practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries has qualifications in SRN (8.3 percent), NVQs (2.8 percent) or BTech (5.6 percent).

- Just over a tenth (11.2 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries have higher degree qualifications, of which half (50 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Just under half (47.2 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Another one in ten (11.1 percent) practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries was qualified by way of a Montessori Certificate.

- Approximately three out of ten (30.6 percent) practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries have other qualifications (e.g. Advanced Diploma in Early Childhood Studies, Certificate of Nursery Workers, Certificate of Froebel Foundation etc.).

- Over half (58.3 percent) of practitioners who are heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries have more than one qualification.

N=36	
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	5.6%
BA	-
BSc	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	50.0%
SRN	8.3%
PGCE	2.8%
NVQs	2.8%
BTech	5.6%
MA/MEd/MAdd	5.6%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	11.1%
Montessori Certificate	11.1%
PPA Short Courses	22.2%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	19.4%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	2.8%
PPA Further Course	2.8%
MPhil/PhD	5.6%
None	-
Others	30.6%
More than one qualification	58.3%

Figure 10 Qualifications Held by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries

5.1.1.9 Qualifications Held by Leaders of Playgroups (Figure 11)

- Six out of ten (60.4 percent) practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups held a PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice (also known as the PPA Foundation Course).

- A further three-quarter (74.8 percent) of practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups have other playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only one in thirty (3.3 percent) practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups was qualified through a Certificate of Education, and all of these were qualified after 1960 with a three year certificate.

- Less than a tenth (8.8 percent) of practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups have first degrees, of which just over a third (37.5 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- Only one in fifty (2.2 percent) practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Less than a fifth (16.5 percent) of practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further one in thirty (3.3 percent) practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups has qualifications in SRN (1.1 percent) or NVQs (2.2 percent).

- A tiny proportion of practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups has higher degree qualifications. Only 1.1 percent have Masters' degrees, for example.

- Approximately one in five (20.9 percent) practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups has other qualifications (e.g. Certificate of the Froebel Foundation, Diploma in Business Management, Playgroup Leaders Course etc.).

- Nearly two-thirds (63.7 percent) of practitioners who are leaders of Playgroups have more than one qualification.

5.1.2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

The following sections present the findings on the qualifications held by heads of institutions in State-Maintained (this includes: Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries) and Non-Maintained (this includes: Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups) sectors of under-8 provision.

N=91

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	3.3%
BA	3.3%
BSc	2.2%
NNEB/City & Guilds	16.5%
SRN	1.1%
PGCE	2.2%
NVQs	2.2%
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.1%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	3.3%
Montessori Certificate	-
PPA Short Courses	52.8%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	60.4%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	3.3%
PPA Further Course	18.7%
MPhil/PhD	-
None	-
Others	20.9%
More than one qualification	63.7%

Figure 11 Qualifications Held by Leaders of Playgroups

5.1.2.1 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions (Figure 12)

- Over half (55.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which just over a fifth (21.1 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Nearly half (47.6 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions have first degrees, of which six out of ten (60.5 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- One in ten (10.6 percent) practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Just over a tenth (13.8 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Approximately one in six (15.5 percent) practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions has higher degree qualifications, of which nearly all (94.8 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Less than a tenth (8.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Over a third (37.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions have other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Certificate in Special Education, Diploma in Child Development).

- Approximately six out of ten (60.4 percent) practitioners who are heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions have more than one qualification.

N=327

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	28.8%
BA	16.3%
BSc	2.5%
NNEB/City & Guilds	13.8%
SRN	-
PGCE	10.6%
NVQs	0.5%
BTech	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	14.7%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	11.7%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	43.8%
Montessori Certificate	-
PPA Short Courses	5.0%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.2%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	1.0%
PPA Further Course	2.3%
MPhil/PhD	0.8%
None	-
Others	37.5%
More than one qualification	60.4%

Figure 12 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5.1.2.2 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions (Figure 13)

- One in four (25.2 percent) practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions was qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which approximately a third (34.1 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- About a quarter (24.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions have first degrees, of which nearly three out of ten (29 percent) of these were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- Less than a tenth (7 percent) practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions were qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

- Just under a quarter (24 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further one in twenty (5 percent) practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions has qualifications in SRN (2.4 percent), NVQs (1.2 percent) or BTech (1.4 percent).

- Less than a tenth (8.8 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions have higher degree qualifications, of which three-quarters (75 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Just over a tenth (11.7 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions were qualified by way of a Montessori Certificate.

- Over half (53.2 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA, of which more than two-fifths (43.6 percent) have a Diploma in Playgroup Practice (also known as the PPA Foundation Course).

- Approximately one in four (24.7 percent) practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions has other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Certificate in Social Services, Certificate of the Froebel Foundation etc.).

- More than half (54.1 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions have more than one qualification.

- However, a very small proportion (0.8 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions has no qualification at all.

N=209

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	7.1%
BA	13.0%
BSc	4.4%
NNEB/City & Guilds	24.0%
SRN	2.4%
PGCE	7.0%
NVQs	1.2%
BTech	1.4%
MA/MEd/MAdd	6.6%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	8.6%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	16.6%
Montessori Certificate	11.7%
PPA Short Courses	23.1%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	23.2%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	1.5%
PPA Further Course	5.4%
MPhil/PhD	2.2%
None	0.8%
Others	24.7%
More than one qualification	54.1%

Figure 13 Qualifications Held by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

5.1.3 Qualifications Held by Heads of Under-8 Institutions in London (Figure 14)

Finally, the qualifications held by heads of all institutions in the state-maintained, independent and voluntary sectors that were surveyed in the London area are reported.

- Around two-fifths (39.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which just under a quarter (23.3 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two year certificate.

- Under two-fifths (38.5 percent) of practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London have first degrees, of which over half (55.1 percent) were qualified initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd).

- Under a tenth (8 percent) of practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London were qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- One in five (20.2 percent) practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London was qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further one in forty (2.5 percent) practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London has qualifications in SRN (0.9 percent), NVQs (0.7 percent) or BTech (0.9 percent)

- Only one in eight (12.7 percent) practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London has higher degree qualifications, of which nearly all (91.3 percent) have Masters' degrees.

- Over a quarter (27.6 percent) of practitioners who are heads of institutions in London have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA, of which a third (33.3 percent) have a Diploma in Playgroup Practice (also known as the PPA Foundation Course).

- Approximately one in three (31.5 percent) practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London has other qualifications (e.g. Diploma in Education, Diploma in Child Development, Certificate of the Froebel Foundation etc.).

- More than half (58.7 percent) of practitioners who are heads of under-8 institutions in London have more than one qualification.

N=267	
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	21.2%
BA	13.9%
BSc	3.4%
NNEB/City & Guilds	20.2%
SRN	0.9%
PGCE	8.0%
NVQs	0.7%
BTech	0.9%
MA/MEd/MAdd	11.6%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	9.2%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	30.3%
Montessori Certificate	6.2%
PPA Short Courses	13.1%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	9.2%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	1.5%
PPA Further Course	3.8%
MPhil/PhD	1.1%
None	-
Others	31.5%
More than one qualification	58.7%

Figure 14 Qualifications Held by Heads of Under-8 Institutions in London

5.2 QUALIFICATIONS HELD BY UNDER-8 PRACTITIONERS (Figures 15, 16 and 17)

- Less than a fifth (19.3 percent) of all practitioners have a first degree, of which a large majority (71.5 percent) has a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of practitioners has a higher degree (0.9 percent), of which the vast majority (88.9 percent) has a Masters' degree.

- A fifth (20.9 percent) of all under-8 practitioners were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds course.

- Under a fifth (18 percent) of all practitioners were qualified as teachers through a Certificate of Education, of which an eighth (12.2 percent) of these were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Only a sixth (16.5 percent) of all practitioners have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- A tenth (10.4 percent) of all practitioners have no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (7 percent) of all practitioners have more than one qualification.

- Under a tenth (7.9 percent) of all practitioners were re-trained to work with under-8s, of which over half (54.4 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

- Over two-fifths (44.85 percent) of practitioners are working as teachers, of which over a quarter (27.1 percent) have a first degree in Education; over a third (37.1 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and only a small proportion (7 percent) holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- Under a fifth (17.47 percent) of practitioners are working as nursery nurses, of which over four-fifths (84.3 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Under a fifth (15.88 percent) of practitioners are working as playgroup assistants, of which over two-thirds (73 percent) of these hold playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only very small proportions of practitioners are working as support teachers (2.77 percent), nursery workers (4.92 percent) and classroom assistants (9.45 percent), with a further small proportion (4.52 percent) working in other roles.

N= 530

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	13.8%
BA	4.0%
BSc	1.5%
NNEB/City & Guilds	20.9%
SRN	0.9%
PGCE	3.3%
NVQs	0.5%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.8%
MPhil/PhD	0.1%
BTech	0.8%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	2.2%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	15.8%
Montessori Certificate	2.4%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	7.9%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.5%
PPA Short Courses	6.6%
PPA Further Course	1.5%
None	10.4%
Others	6.1%
More than one qualification	7.0%

Figure 15 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners

N=530

Age Range	
0-3	1.6%
0-5	4.3%
5-8	0.5%
3-8	1.5%

Figure 16 Proportion of Practitioners Retrained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

N= 530

				Roles			
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	12.16%	0.78%	0.33%	0.11%	0.22%	0.11%	0.11%
BA	3.68%	0.11%	0.02%	0.02%	0.06%	0.11%	0.02%
BSc	1.12%	0.03%	0.11%	0.11%	-	0.06%	0.11%
NNEB/City & Guilds	2.12%	0.33%	14.72%	1.56%	1.00%	1.00%	0.11%
SRN	0.22%	0.11%	0.03%	0.04%	0.11%	0.22%	0.11%
PGCE	3.12%	0.11%	0.01%	-	-	0.02%	-
NVQs	0.22%	-	0.11%	0.06%	0.11%	-	0.03%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.67%	0.11%	-	-	-	0.04%	0.01%
MPhil/PhD	0.11%	0.01%	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	0.11%	-	0.33%	0.22%	0.11%	0.03%	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	2.01%	0.11%	-	-	-	0.03%	0.01%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	14.61%	0.56%	0.04%	-	0.11%	0.11%	0.33%
Montessori Certificate	1.56%	0.11%	0.33%	0.01%	0.11%	0.22%	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.22%	0.11%	0.22%	0.78%	0.45%	6.02%	0.11%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	0.01%	-	0.11%	0.03%	0.33%	-
PPA Short Courses	0.56%	0.11%	0.22%	0.67%	0.67%	4.24%	0.11%
PPA Further Course	0.02%	-	0.11%	0.11%	0.11%	1.00%	0.11%
None	0.22%	0.06%	0.33%	0.67%	5.13%	1.45%	2.57%
Other Qualifications	2.12%	0.11%	0.56%	0.45%	1.23%	0.89%	0.78%

Figure 17 Qualifications & Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners

5.2.1 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision

The following sections present the findings on the qualifications held by under-8 practitioners in Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools, Local Authority Day Nurseries, Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups.

5.2.1.1 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Nursery Schools (Figures 18, 19 and 20)

- Only one in six (16.7 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools has a first degree, of which over three-quarters (77.2 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- Very few under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools have a higher degree (0.9 percent), and all of these have a Masters' degree.

- Over two-fifths (46 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- A further very small proportion (3.5 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Around one in seven (15.8 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools was qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which less than a tenth (8.2 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- A very small proportion (2.2 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Under a tenth (8.9 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools have no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (7.2 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools have more than one qualification.

- Over two-fifths (41.41 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Nursery Schools are working as teachers, of which more than a quarter (28.2 percent) have a first degree in Education; over a third (35.9 percent) of these held a Certificate of Education, and less than a tenth (8.5 percent) of these held a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- More than two out of five (42.97 percent) under-8 practitioners in Nursery Schools are working as nursery nurses, of which nearly all (90.9 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Nursery Schools are working as support teachers (1.66 percent), nursery workers (2.68 percent) and classroom assistants (4.45 percent), with a further small proportion (6.81 percent) working in other roles.

- Less than one in twenty (4.8 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Nursery Schools was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which over three-quarters (77.1 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

5.2.1.2 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Infant/First Schools (Figures 21, 22 and 23)

- More than one in four (27.9 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools have a first degree, of which over two-thirds (68.8 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools has a higher degree (0.9 percent), and all of these have a Masters' degree.

- Under a tenth (9.3 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds course.

N=89	
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	12.9%
BA	2.0%
BSc	1.8%
NNEB/City & Guilds	46.0%
SRN	0.5%
PGCE	3.5%
NVQs	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.9%
MPhil/PhD	-
BTech	0.2%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	1.3%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	14.5%
Montessori Certificate	0.3%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.3%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-
PPA Short Courses	1.1%
PPA Further Course	0.8%
None	8.9%
Others	5.0%
More than one qualification	7.2%

Figure 18 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Nursery Schools

- A further one in twenty (5.5 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Less than a third (31.8 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which over a tenth (12.3 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Less than one in twenty (4.7 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Over a tenth (12.1 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools have no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (6.4 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools have more than one qualification.

N=89

				Roles			
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	11.67%	0.52%	0.41%	-	0.10%	-	0.21%
BA	1.96%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BSc	0.72%	-	0.72%	0.31%	-	-	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	4.34%	0.21%	39.05%	1.14%	0.93%	-	0.31%
SRN	0.31%	-	0.21%	-	-	-	-
PGCE	3.51%	-	-	-	-	-	-
NVQs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.83%	0.10%	-	-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	-	-	0.21%	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	1.34%		-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	13.53%	0.83%	-	-	-	-	0.10%
Montessori Certificate	0.31%	-	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.10%	-	0.10%	0.10%	-	-	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Short Courses	0.10%	-	-	0.41%	0.52%	-	0.10%
PPA Further Course	-	-	0.41%	-	-	-	0.41%
None	0.62%	-	0.93%	0.62%	2.07%	-	4.65%
Other Qualifications	2.07%	-	0.93%	0.10%	0.83%	-	1.03%

Figure 19 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Nursery Schools

N=89

Age Range	
0-3	0.4%
0-5	3.7%
5-8	-
3-8	0.7%

Figure 20 Proportion of Practitioners in Nursery Schools Re-trained to work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

- Nearly two-thirds (65.19 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Infant/First Schools are working as teachers, of which more than a quarter (27.9 percent) have a first degree in Education; over two-fifths (44.2 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and less than a tenth (7.9 percent) hold a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- Less than a tenth (7.23 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Infant/First Schools are working as nursery nurses, of which over four-fifths (83.8 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Nearly one in six (16.31 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Infant/First Schools is working as classroom assistants, of which over a fifth (22.1 percent) of these have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Infant/First Schools are working as support teachers (4.02 percent) and nursery workers (0.24 percent), with a further small proportion (7 percent) working in other roles.

- Only a very small proportion (3.6 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Infant/First Schools was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which just one in six (16.7 percent) was re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

5.2.1.3 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Primary Schools (Figures 24, 25 and 26)

- More than one in three (34.7 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools have a first degree, of which over three-quarters (76.7 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools has a higher degree (1.3 percent), and all of these has a Masters' degree.

- Under a tenth (7.1 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further small proportion (6 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Over a quarter (29.1 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which over a tenth (12 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- A further very small proportion (2.8 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

N=70

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	19.2%
BA	6.7%
BSc	2.0%
NNEB/City & Guilds	9.3%
SRN	0.7%
PGCE	5.5%
NVQs	1.1%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.9%
MPhil/PhD	0.0%
BTech	0.2%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	3.9%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	27.9%
Montessori Certificate	0.2%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	1.2%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.2%
PPA Short Courses	2.7%
PPA Further Course	0.6%
None	12.1%
Others	5.6%
More than one qualification	6.4%

Figure 21 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Infant/First Schools

- Over a tenth (13.9 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools have no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (6.6 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools have more than one qualification.

- More than two-thirds (69.5 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Primary Schools are working as teachers, of which over a third (35.7 percent) have a first degree in Education; under two-fifths (38.6 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and less than a tenth (7.9 percent) hold a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- Approximately one in twenty (5.69 percent) under-8 practitioners in Primary Schools is working as nursery nurses, of which over four-fifths (81.9 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

N=70

	Roles						
Qualifications	**Teachers**	**Support Teachers**	**Nursery Nurses**	**Nursery Workers**	**Classroom Assistants**	**Playgroup Assistants**	**Others**
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	18.19%	0.70%	-	0.12%	0.23%	-	-
BA	6.41%	0.12%	0.12%	-	-	-	-
BSc	1.75%	0.12%	-	-	-	-	0.12%
NNEB/City & Guilds	1.63%	0.35%	6.06%	-	1.05%	-	0.23%
SRN	0.12%	-	-	-	0.58%	-	-
PGCE	5.13%	0.35%	-	-	-	-	-
NVQs	0.23%	-	-	-	0.58%	-	0.23%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.93%	-	-	-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	-	-	0.23%	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	3.38%	0.47%	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	25.43%	1.63%	-	-	0.35%	-	0.47%
Montessori Certificate	0.12%	-	-	-	0.12%	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-	-	0.12%	-	1.05%	-	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	-	0.23%	-	-
PPA Short Courses	0.70%	-	-	-	1.75%	-	0.23%
PPA Further Course	-	-	-	-	0.58%	-	-
None	-	0.23%	-	0.12%	6.76%	-	5.02%
Other Qualifications	1.17%	0.05%	0.70%	-	3.03%	-	0.70%

Figure 22 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Infant/First Schools

N=70

Age Range	
0-3	0.2%
0-5	0.6%
5-8	1.2%
3-8	1.6%

Figure 23 Proportion of Practitioners in Infants/First Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Around one in seven (14.91 percent) under-8 practitioners in Primary Schools is working as classroom assistants, of which over two-thirds (71.7 percent) have no qualification at all.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Primary Schools are working as support teachers (4.66 percent) and nursery workers (0.11 percent), with a further small proportion (5.12 percent) working in other roles.

- Only a very small proportion (1.4 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Primary Schools was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which just one in seven (14.3 percent) was re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N= 85

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	26.6%
BA	6.0%
BSc	2.1%
NNEB/City & Guilds	7.1%
SRN	0.5%
PGCE	6.0%
NVQs	0.1%
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.3%
MPhil/PhD	0.0%
BTech	0.0%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	3.5%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	25.6%
Montessori Certificate	0.0%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	1.5%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.1%
PPA Short Courses	1.0%
PPA Further Course	0.2%
None	13.9%
Others	4.6%
More than one qualification	6.6%

Figure 24 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Primary Schools

N= 85

	Roles						
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	24.80%	1.48%	0.23%	-	-	-	0.11%
BA	5.57%	0.46%	-	-	-	-	-
BSc	1.93%	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	1.37%	-	4.66%	0.11%	0.91%	-	-
SRN	0.34%	-	-	-	0.11%	-	-
PGCE	5.46%	0.46%	0.11%	-	-	-	-
NVQs	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.11%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.91%	0.34%	-	-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	3.41%	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	23.44%	1.02%	0.23%	-	0.80%	-	0.11%
Montessori Certificate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-	0.11%	-	-	0.57%	-	0.80%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Short Courses	0.34%	-	-	-	0.46%	-	0.23%
PPA Further Course	-	-	-	-	0.23%	-	-
None	-	-	-	-	10.69%	-	3.19%
Other Qualifications	1.93%	0.46%	0.46%	-	1.14%	-	0.57%

Figure 25 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Primary Schools

N=85

Age Range	
0-3	0.4%
0-5	0.2%
5-8	0.4%
3-8	0.4%

Figure 26 Proportion of Practitioners in Primary Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

5.2.1.4 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Special Schools (Figures 27, 28 and 29)

- More than one in four (26.3 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools have a first degree, and over three-quarters (77.6 percent) of these have a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools has a higher degree (1.5 percent), and nearly all (93.3 percent) of these are Masters' degree.

- Under a fifth (18.4 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds course.

- A further very small proportion (2.8 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Just under a fifth (19.7 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which over a tenth (12.2 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Less than one in twenty (4.5 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Around one in six (16.4 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools has no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (8.7 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools have more than one qualification.

- More than one in two (51.45 percent) under-8 practitioners in Special Schools are working as teachers, of which nearly a third (32.1 percent) have a first degree in Education, a further third (34.7 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and around one in twenty (5.4 percent) holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- More than one in seven (15.88 percent) under-8 practitioners in Special Schools are working as nursery nurses, of which over four-fifths (88.6 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- More than one in five (22.23 percent) under-8 practitioners in Special Schools are working as classroom assistants, of which over half (55.1 percent) have no qualification at all.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Special Schools are working as support teachers (2.46 percent) and nursery workers (1.72 percent), with a further small proportion (6.23 percent) working in other roles.

- Only a very small proportion (2.5 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Special Schools was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which less than a tenth (8 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N=58

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	20.4%
BA	4.3%
BSc	1.6%
NNEB/City & Guilds	18.4%
SRN	1.1%
PGCE	2.8%
NVQs	0.1%
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.4%
MPhil/PhD	0.1%
BTech	0.6%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	2.4%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	17.3%
Montessori Certificate	0.2%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.4%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.0%
PPA Short Courses	4.1%
PPA Further Course	0.0%
None	16.4%
Others	8.4%
More than one qualification	8.7%

Figure 27 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Special Schools

5.2.1.5 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Local Authority Day Nurseries (Figures 30, 31 and 32)

- Just over one in ten (11.8 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries have a first degree, of which nearly all (95.8 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- Over two-thirds (68.2 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries were qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (0.8 percent), SRN (0.4 percent), BTech (0.7 percent) and Montessori Certificate (0.4 percent).

N= 59

	Roles						
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	16.54%	1.83%	0.32%	-	1.72%	-	-
BA	4.30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BSc	1.61%	-	-	-	-	-	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	1.61%	-	14.07%	-	2.58%	-	0.11%
SRN	0.21%	-	-	-	0.21%	-	0.64%
PGCE	2.79%	-	-	-	-	-	-
NVQs	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.40%	-	-	-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	-	-	-	-	0.64%	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	2.15%	0.21%	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	15.68%	0.21%	-	-	-	-	1.40%
Montessori Certificate	-	-	0.21%	-	-	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-	-	0.32%	-	0.11%	-	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Short Courses	1.40%	-	0.54%	0.86%	1.29%	-	-
PPA Further Course	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None	0.32%	-	0.21%	0.86%	12.24%	-	2.79%
Other Qualifications	3.22%	0.21%	0.21%	-	3.44%	-	1.29%

Figure 28 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Special Schools

N=59

Age Range	
0-3	2.2%
0-5	0.2%
5-8	-
3-8	0.1%

Figure 29 Proportion of Practitioners in Special Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

- A further very small proportion (1.2 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries was qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which all were qualified after 1960 with a three-year Certificate of Education.

- Under a tenth (8.9 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- None of the under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries who were surveyed has a higher degree.

- Only a small proportion (3.3 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries has no qualification at all.

- Just a small proportion (3.6 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries has more than one qualification.

- Less than a tenth (8.09 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Local Authority Day Nurseries are working as teachers, of which more than two-thirds (70.1 percent) have a first degree in Education; over one in seven (15 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and a tenth (10 percent) hold a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- More than six out of ten (61.02 percent) under-8 practitioners in Local Authority Day Nurseries are working as nursery nurses, of which the vast majority (87.3 percent) was qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Over a quarter (27.94 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Local Authority Day Nurseries are working as nursery workers, of which nearly half (49.6 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Local Authority Day Nurseries schools are working as support teachers (0.4 percent) and classroom assistants (0.71 percent), with a further small proportion (1.82 percent) working in other roles.

- Only one in fifteen (6.8 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Local Authority Day Nurseries was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which almost all (94.1 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N=19

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	11.3%
BA	0.5%
BSc	0.0%
NNEB/City & Guilds	68.2%
SRN	0.4%
PGCE	0.8%
NVQs	0.0%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.0%
MPhil/PhD	0.0%
BTech	0.7%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	0.0%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	1.2%
Montessori Certificate	0.4%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	7.9%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.0%
PPA Short Courses	0.4%
PPA Further Course	0.6%
None	3.3%
Others	4.2%
More than one qualification	3.6%

Figure 30 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Local Authority Day Nurseries

5.2.1.6 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Preparatory Schools (Figures 33, 34 and 35)

- More than one in four (27 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools have a first degree, of which over half (54.1 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools has a higher degree (2.2 percent), and over two-fifths (45.5 percent) of these are Masters' degrees.

- Under a tenth (8.1 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

N= 19

				Roles			
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	5.67%	0.40%	4.05%	1.21%	-	-	-
BA	-	-	-	0.51%	-	-	-
BSc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	-	-	53.24%	13.87%	-	-	1.11%
SRN	0.40%	-	-	-	-	-	-
PGCE	0.81%	-	-	-	-	-	-
NVQs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	-	-	-	0.71%	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	1.21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Montessori Certificate	-	-	0.40%	-	-	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-	-	2.02%	5.87%	-	-	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Short Courses	-	-	0.40%	-	-	-	-
PPA Further Course	-	-	-	0.61%	-	-	-
None	-	-	-	2.63%	0.71%	-	-
Other Qualifications	-	-	0.91%	2.53%	-	-	0.71%

Figure 31 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Local Authority Day Nurseries

N=19

Age Range	
0-3	-
0-5	6.4%
5-8	0.4%
3-8	-

Figure 32 Proportion of Practitioners in Local Authority Day Nurseries Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

- A further one in twenty (5.1 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Just under a third (32.2 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which over a tenth (14.3 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools were qualified by way of SRN (1.2 percent), BTech (0.1 percent) and Montessori Certificate (7 percent), with a further small proportion (3.2 percent) having playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Around one in seventeen (6 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools has no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (7.6 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools have more than one qualification.

- Nearly four out of five (79.53 percent) under-8 practitioners in Independent Preparatory Schools are working as teachers, of which less than a fifth (17.1 percent) have a first degree in Education, over a third (38.7 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and less than a tenth (6.1 percent) hold a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- Less than a tenth (7.49 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Independent Preparatory Schools are working as classroom assistants, of which nearly half (49.3 percent) have no qualification at all.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Independent Preparatory Schools are working as support teachers (4.33 percent), nursery nurses (4.54 percent) and nursery workers (1.9 percent), with a further very small proportion (2.2 percent) working in other roles.

- Only a very small proportion (1.9 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Preparatory Schools was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which just over a fifth (21.1 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N= 56

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	14.6%
BA	10.2%
BSc	2.2%
NNEB/City & Guilds	8.1%
SRN	1.2%
PGCE	5.1%
NVQs	0.0%
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.0%
MPhil/PhD	1.2%
BTech	0.1%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	4.6%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	27.6%
Montessori Certificate	7.0%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	2.0%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.0%
PPA Short Courses	1.2%
PPA Further Course	0.0%
None	6.0%
Others	8.0%
More than one qualification	7.6%

Figure 33 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Preparatory Schools

X 5.2.1.7

~~5.1.2.7~~ Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Nursery Schools (Figures 36, 37 and 38)

- Only one in sixteen (6.2 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools has a first degree, of which over a third (35.5 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- Approximately a fifth (19.2 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further one in five (19.9 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools was qualified by way of a Montessori Certificate.

N= 56

	Roles						
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	13.61%	0.63%	0.21%	-	-	-	0.11%
BA	9.18%	0.42%	-	-	0.42%	-	0.21%
BSc	2.00%	-	-	-	-	-	0.21%
NNEB/City & Guilds	2.43%	0.53%	3.80%	0.84%	0.53%	-	-
SRN	0.32%	0.63%	-	-	0.21%	-	-
PGCE	4.85%	0.21%	-	-	-	-	-
NVQs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.84%	-	-	-	-	-	0.11%
MPhil/PhD	1.05%	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	4.22%	0.42%	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	26.58%	0.74%	-	-	-	-	0.32%
Montessori Certificate	6.43%	-	0.32%	-	0.21%	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.42%	-	-	0.32%	1.27%	-	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Short Courses	0.42%	-	-	0.11%	0.63%	-	-
PPA Further Course	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None	0.32%	0.32%	-	0.63%	3.69%	-	1.05%
Other Qualifications	6.75%	0.32%	0.21%	-	0.53%	-	0.21%

Figure 34 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners in Independent Preparatory School

N=56

Age Range	
0-3	1.2%
0-5	0.4%
5-8	-
3-8	0.3%

Figure 35 Proportion of Practitioners in Independent Preparatory Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

- Just over a tenth (11.5 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which under a fifth (17.4 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Under a fifth (18 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools were qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (1.7 percent), SRN (0.7 percent) and BTech (1.9 percent).

- None of the under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools who were surveyed has a higher degree.

- One in ten (10.6 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools has no qualification at all.

- Over a tenth (13.9 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools have more than one qualification.

- Over half (52.37 percent) of under-8 practitioners in Independent Nursery Schools are working as teachers, of which only a very small proportion (4.2 percent) has a first degree in Education; over a fifth (21.3 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and a further small proportion (3.2 percent) holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- One in six (16.76 percent) under-8 practitioners in Independent Nursery Schools is working as nursery workers, of which nearly half (49.7 percent) hold playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- One in eight (12.76 percent) under-8 practitioners in Independent Nursery Schools is working as classroom assistants, of which half (50.4) have no qualification at all.

- Only small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Independent Nursery Schools are working as support teachers (6.54 percent) and nursery nurses (5.89 percent), with a further small proportion (5.7 percent) working in other roles.

- One in ten (10.4 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Independent Nursery Schools was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which over two-thirds (69.2 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N= 23

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	2.2%
BA	2.2%
BSc	1.8%
NNEB/City & Guilds	19.2%
SRN	0.7%
PGCE	1.7%
NVQs	0.0%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.0%
MPhil/PhD	0.0%
BTech	1.9%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	2.0%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	9.5%
Montessori Certificate	19.9%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	5.8%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.0%
PPA Short Courses	11.1%
PPA Further Course	1.1%
None	10.6%
Others	10.3%
More than one qualification	13.9%

Figure 36 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Nursery Schools

5.2.1.8 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Private and Workplace Nurseries (Figure 39, 40 and 41)

- More than two out of five (45.8 percent) under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Around one in five (19.5 percent) under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries has playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only a very small proportion (2.5 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries has a first degree, of which over two-thirds (68 percent) have a first degree in Education.

N= 24

				Roles			
Qualifications	**Teachers**	**Support Teachers**	**Nursery Nurses**	**Nursery Workers**	**Classroom Assistants**	**Playgroup Assistants**	**Others**
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	2.21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BA	1.69%	0.53%	-	-	-	-	-
BSc	1.26%	-	-	-	-	-	0.53%
NNEB/City & Guilds	7.69%	2.95%	3.79%	2.00%	2.74%	-	-
SRN	0.53%	-	-	-	0.21%	-	-
PGCE	1.69%	-	-	-	-	-	-
NVQs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	0.84%	-	-	1.05%	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	1.69%	-	-	-	-	-	0.32%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	9.48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Montessori Certificate	16.44%	0.74%	1.05%	-	1.69%	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	2.11%	0.42%	-	2.85%	0.42%	-	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PPA Short Courses	3.58%	1.37%	-	4.43%	0.74%	-	0.95%
PPA Further Course	-	-	-	1.05%	-	-	-
None	0.95%	-	1.05%	1.69%	6.43%	-	0.53%
Other Qualifications	2.21%	0.53%	-	3.69%	0.53%	-	3.37%

Figure 37 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Independent Nursery Schools

N=24

Age Range	
0-3	3.2%
0-5	7.2%
5-8	-
3-8	-

Figure 38 Proportion of Practitioners in Independent Nursery Schools Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries were qualified through a Certificate of Education (0.7 percent), SRN (1.3 percent), NVQs (4.4 percent), BTech (6.1 percent) and Montessori Certificate (5.3 percent).

- None of the under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries who were surveyed has a higher degree.

- Furthermore, none of the under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Under a tenth (7.5 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries have no qualification at all.

- Around one in twenty (4.7 percent) under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries has more than one qualification.

- Only one in ten (10.91 percent) under-8 practitioners in private or workplace nurseries is working as teachers, of which only very small proportions have a first degree in Education (5.8 percent) and a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (5.8 percent).

- More than two out of five (45.33 percent) under-8 practitioners in private or workplace nurseries are working as nursery nurses, of which over two-thirds (68.4 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further one in three (33.98 percent) under-8 practitioners in private or workplace nurseries is working as nursery workers, of which nearly a third (32.1 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses and around two-fifths (39.5 percent) have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only small proportions of under-8 practitioners in Private and Workplace Nurseries are working as support teachers (6.13 percent) and classroom assistants (2.4 percent), with a further very small proportion (1.27 percent) working in other roles.

- Only around one in fourteen (7.4 percent) under-8 practitioners working in private or workplace nurseries was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which just over three-fifths (62.2 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N= 36

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	1.7%
BA	0.5%
BSc	0.3%
NNEB/City & Guilds	45.8%
SRN	1.3%
PGCE	0.0%
NVQs	4.4%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.0%
MPhil/PhD	0.0%
BTech	6.1%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	0.4%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	0.3%
Montessori Certificate	5.3%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	9.8%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	1.1%
PPA Short Courses	7.2%
PPA Further Course	1.4%
None	7.5%
Others	6.8%
More than one qualification	4.7%

Figure 39 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Private and Workplace Nurseries

5.2.1.9 **Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Playgroups** (Figures 42, 43 and 44)

- More than seven out of ten (73.6 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Playgroups have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA, of which over half (51.8 percent) hold a PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice (also known as the PPA Foundation Course).

- Around one in sixteen (6.2 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Playgroups was qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds course.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners working in Playgroups have a first degree (1.7 percent), a Certificate in Education (0.7 percent), a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (0.1 percent), a Montessori Certificate (1.1 percent), a BTech (0.3 percent) and a SRN (1.4 percent).

N= 35

Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	*Roles* Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	0.63%	1.14%	-	-	-	-	-
BA	0.51%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BSc	-	0.05%	0.25%	-	-	-	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	2.03%	1.27%	31.02%	10.89%	0.63%	-	-
SRN	0.51%	-	-	0.76%	-	-	-
PGCE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NVQs	2.28%	-	1.27%	0.89%	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	0.51%	-	4.05%	1.52%	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	0.38%	-	-	0.05%	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	0.25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Montessori Certificate	0.13%	1.52%	3.42%	0.25%	-	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.89%	1.39%	0.51%	6.96%	-	-	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	1.14%	-	-	-
PPA Short Courses	0.38%	0.63%	1.90%	4.30%	-	-	-
PPA Further Course	0.38%	-	-	1.01%	-	-	-
None	0.51%	-	1.01%	3.17%	1.52%	-	1.27%
Other Qualifications	1.52%	0.13%	1.90%	3.04%	0.25%	-	-

Figure 40 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Private and Workplace Nurseries

N=35

Age Range	
0-3	1.4%
0-5	4.6%
5-8	0.6%
3-8	0.8%

Figure 41 Proportion of Practitioners in Private and Workplace Nurseries Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

- A further very low proportion of under-8 practitioners working in Playgroups has a higher degree (0.3 percent), and all of these have Masters' degrees.

- Under a tenth (9.1 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in Playgroups have no qualification at all.

- Around one in seventeen (6 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Playgroups has more than one qualification.

- All of the under-8 practitioners in Playgroups are working as playgroup assistants.

- More than one in four (26.4 percent) under-8 practitioners working in Playgroups were re-trained to work with under-8s, of which over half (56.8 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N= 93

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	0.8%
BA	0.5%
BSc	0.4%
NNEB/City & Guilds	6.2%
SRN	1.4%
PGCE	0.1%
NVQs	0.0%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.3%
MPhil/PhD	0.0%
BTech	0.3%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	0.1%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	0.6%
Montessori Certificate	1.1%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	38.1%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	2.0%
PPA Short Courses	27.1%
PPA Further Course	6.4%
None	9.1%
Others	5.6%
More than one qualification	6.0%

Figure 42 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Playgroups

N= 93

	Roles						
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	-	-	-	-	-	0.75%	-
BA	-	-	-	-	-	0.50%	-
BSc	-	-	-	-	-	0.37%	-
NNEB/City & Guilds	-	-	-	-	-	6.24%	-
SRN	-	-	-	-	-	1.37%	-
PGCE	-	-	-	-	-	0.12%	-
NVQs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	-	-	-	-	-	0.25%	-
MPhil/PhD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	-	-	-	-	-	0.25%	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	-	-	-	-	-	0.12%	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	-	-	-	-	-	0.62%	-
Montessori Certificate	-	-	-	-	-	1.12%	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	-	-	-	-	-	38.08%	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	-	-	2.00%	-
PPA Short Courses	-	-	-	-	-	27.09%	-
PPA Further Course	-	-	-	-	-	6.37%	-
None	-	-	-	-	-	9.11%	-
Other Qualifications	-	-	-	-	-	5.62%	-

Figure 43 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Playgroups

N=93

Age Range	
0-3	5.0%
0-5	15.0%
5-8	0.8%
3-8	5.6%

Figure 44 Proportion of Practitioners in Playgroups Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

5.2.2 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Provisions

The following sections present the findings on the qualifications held by under-8 practitioners in State-Maintained (this includes: Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries) and Non-Maintained (this includes: Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups) sectors of under-8 provision.

5.2.2.1 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in State-Maintained Provision (Figure 45, 46 and 47)

- Approximately one in four (24.9 percent) under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision has a first degree, of which over three-quarters (76.3 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision has a higher degree (1.1 percent), and all of these have a Masters' degree.

- One in four (25 percent) under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision was qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further one in twenty-five (4.3 percent) under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- More than one in five (22 percent) under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which a tenth (10.9 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in state-maintained provision have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA (3.9 percent), a SRN (0.7 percent), NVQs (0.3 percent), a BTech (0.3 percent) and a Montessori Certificate (0.2 percent).

- Over a tenth (11.8 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision have no qualification at all.

- Around one in fifteen (7 percent) under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision has more than one qualification.

- Over half (52.94 percent) of under-8 practitioners in state-maintained provision are working as teachers, of which nearly a third (31.7 percent) have a first degree in Education; over a third (38.3 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and less than a tenth (7.6 percent) hold a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- More than one in five (22.54 percent) under-8 practitioners in state-maintained provision are working as nursery nurses, of which over four-fifths (88.1 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Over a tenth (12.62 percent) of under-8 practitioners in state-maintained provision are working as classroom assistants, of which over half (55.3 percent) have no qualification at all.

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners in state-maintained provision are working as support teachers (2.73 percent) and nursery workers (3.17 percent), with a further small proportion (6.03 percent) working in other roles.

- Only a very small proportion (3.4 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in state-maintained provision was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which nearly half (47.1 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N= 322

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	19.0%
BA	4.2%
BSc	1.7%
NNEB/City & Guilds	25.0%
SRN	0.7%
PGCE	4.3%
NVQs	0.3%
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.1%
MPhil/PhD	0.0%
BTech	0.3%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	2.4%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	19.6%
Montessori Certificate	0.2%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	1.3%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.1%
PPA Short Courses	2.0%
PPA Further Course	0.5%
None	11.8%
Others	5.6%
More than one qualification	7.0%

Figure 45 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in State-Maintained Provision

N= 322

				Roles			
Qualifications	Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	16.80%	0.98%	0.55%	0.11%	0.44%	-	0.11%
BA	4.04%	0.11%	0.03%	0.03%	-	-	-
BSc	1.31%	0.04%	0.22%	0.11%	-	-	0.02%
NNEB/City & Guilds	2.29%	0.11%	19.86%	1.31%	1.20%	-	0.22%
SRN	0.22%	-	0.11%	-	0.22%	-	0.11%
PGCE	4.04%	0.22%	0.02%	-	-	-	-
NVQs	0.11%	-	-	-	0.11%	-	0.11%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.98%	0.11%		-	-	-	-
MPhil/PhD	0.01%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	-	-	0.11%	0.04%	0.11%	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	2.29%	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	18.00%	0.87%	0.11%	-	0.22%	-	0.44%
Montessori Certificate	0.11%	-	0.11%	-	0.02%	-	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.01%	0.02%	0.22%	0.44%	0.44%	-	0.22%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	0.02%	-	-	0.04%	-	-
PPA Short Courses	0.55%	-	0.11%	0.33%	0.87%	-	0.11%
PPA Further Course	-	-	0.11%	0.03%	0.22%	-	0.11%
None	0.22%	0.03%	0.33%	0.55%	6.98%	-	3.71%
Other Qualifications	1.96%	0.11%	0.65%	0.22%	1.75%	-	0.87%

Figure 46 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in State-Maintained Provision

N=322

Age Range	
0-3	0.7%
0-5	1.6%
5-8	0.4%
3-8	0.7%

Figure 47 Proportion of Under-8 Practitioners in State-Maintained Provision Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

5.2.2.2 **Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Non-Maintained Provision** (Figures 48, 49 and 50)

- Around one in ten (9.9 percent) under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision has a first degree, of which over half (52.5 percent) have a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision has a higher degree (0.8 percent), of which half (50 percent) are Masters' degrees.

- One in seven (14.5 percent) under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision was qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- A further very small proportion (1.9 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision was qualified by way of a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- Just over a tenth (11.6 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision were qualified through a Certificate of Education, of which around one in seven (15.5 percent) was qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Over a third (36.7 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA, of which over half (51 percent) have a PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice (also known as the PPA Foundation Course).

- Only very small proportions of under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision have a SRN (1.3 percent), NVQs (0.7 percent), a BTech (1.3 percent) and a Montessori Certificate (6 percent).

- One in twelve (8.3 percent) under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision has no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (7.4 percent) of under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision have more than one qualification.

- Nearly one in three (32.01 percent) under-8 practitioners in non-maintained provision is working as teachers, of which over a tenth (13.9 percent) have a first degree in Education; around a third (33.6 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and approximately one in twenty (5.1 percent) holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- Less than a tenth (9.32 percent) of under-8 practitioners in non-maintained provision are working as nursery nurses, of which over two-thirds (68.9 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- More than two out of five (41.78 percent) under-8 practitioners in non-maintained provision are working as playgroup assistants, of which nearly three-quarters (73.5 percent) have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only small proportions of under-8 practitioners in non-maintained provision are working as support teachers (3.17 percent), nursery workers (7.87 percent) and classroom assistants (4.2 percent), with a further very small proportion (1.65 percent) working in other roles.

- Around one in seven (14.6 percent) under-8 practitioners working in non-maintained provision was re-trained to work with under-8s, of which over half (56.8 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

N= 208

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	5.2%
BA	3.7%
BSc	1.0%
NNEB/City & Guilds	14.5%
SRN	1.3%
PGCE	1.9%
NVQs	0.7%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.4%
MPhil/PhD	0.4%
BTech	1.3%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	1.8%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	9.8%
Montessori Certificate	6.0%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	18.7%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.9%
PPA Short Courses	14.1%
PPA Further Course	3.0%
None	8.3%
Others	7.1%
More than one qualification	7.4%

Figure 48 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Non-Maintained Provision

N= 208

	Roles Teachers	Support Teachers	Nursery Nurses	Nursery Workers	Classroom Assistants	Playgroup Assistants	Others
Qualifications							
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	4.44%	0.35%	0.06%	-	-	0.35%	0.04%
BA	3.03%	0.23%	-	-	0.12%	0.23%	0.12%
BSc	0.70%	0.01%	0.04%	-	-	0.12%	0.12%
NNEB/City & Guilds	1.98%	0.70%	6.42%	2.22%	0.58%	2.57%	-
SRN	0.23%	0.23%	-	0.12%	0.12%	0.58%	-
PGCE	1.63%	0.12%	-	-	-	0.12%	-
NVQs	0.35%	-	0.23%	0.12%	-	-	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.23%	-	-	-	-	0.12%	0.04%
MPhil/PhD	0.35%	0.02%	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	0.23%	-	0.58%	0.35%	-	0.12%	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	1.52%	0.12%	-	0.01%	-	0.12%	0.04%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	9.22%	0.23%	-	-	-	0.23%	0.12%
Montessori Certificate	4.08%	0.35%	0.82%	0.04%	0.23%	0.47%	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.47%	0.23%	0.12%	1.52%	0.47%	15.87%	-
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	0.12%	-	0.82%	-
PPA Short Courses	0.58%	0.23%	0.35%	1.28%	0.23%	11.32%	0.12%
F[illegible] Further Course	0.05%	-	-	0.23%	-	2.68%	-
None	0.35%	0.12%	0.35%	0.93%	2.22%	3.73%	0.58%
Other Qualifications	2.57%	0.23%	0.35%	0.93%	0.23%	2.33%	0.47%

Figure 49 Qualifications and Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners Working in Non-Maintained Provision

N=208

Age Range	
0-3	3.1%
0-5	8.3%
5-8	0.5%
3-8	2.7%

Figure 50 Proportion of Under-8 Practitioners in Non-Maintained Provision Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

5.2.3 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in London (Figures 51, 52 and 53)

Finally, the qualifications held by under-8 practitioners of all institutions in the state-maintained, independent and voluntary sectors that were surveyed in the London area are reported.

- A fifth (20.5 percent) of all practitioners in London have a first degree, of which the majority (73.7 percent) has a first degree in Education.

- A very low proportion of practitioners in London has a higher degree (1.2 percent), of which almost all (91.7 percent) have a Masters' degree.

- Just over a fifth (22.8 percent) of all practitioners in London were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Just over an eighth (12.9 percent) of all practitioners in London were qualified as teachers through a Certificate of Education, of which a seventh (14.7 percent) were qualified before 1960 with a two-year Certificate of Education.

- Just over a sixth (17.6 percent) of practitioners in London have playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- A tenth (10.1 percent) of all practitioners in London have no qualification at all.

- Under a tenth (7.4 percent) of all practitioners in London have more than one qualification.

- Just under a tenth (9.2 percent) of all practitioners in London were re-trained to work with under-8s, of which over half (56.5 percent) were re-trained in the 0-5 years age range.

- Over two-fifths (42.37 percent) of practitioners are working as teachers, of which just under a third (30.1 percent) have a first degree in Education, over a quarter (28.1 percent) hold a Certificate of Education, and only a small proportion (7.3 percent) holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Education.

- Under a fifth (18.67 percent) of practitioners are working as nursery nurses, of which over four-fifths (83.2 percent) were qualified by way of NNEB/City and Guilds courses.

- Under a fifth (18.64 percent) of practitioners are working as playgroup assistants, of which over two-thirds (70.9 percent) hold playgroup qualifications accredited by PPA.

- Only very small proportions of practitioners are working as support teachers (3.42 percent), nursery workers (5.3 percent) and classroom assistants (6.77 percent), with a further small proportion (4.81 percent) working in other roles.

N=265

BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	15.1%
BA	4.1%
BSc	1.3%
NNEB/City & Guilds	22.8%
SRN	0.7%
PGCE	3.4%
NVQs	0.4%
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.1%
MPhil/PhD	0.1%
BTech	0.4%
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	1.9%
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	11.0%
Montessori Certificate	3.2%
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	9.0%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	0.4%
PPA Short Courses	6.7%
PPA Further Course	1.5%
None	10.1%
Others	6.3%
More than one qualification	7.4%

Figure 51 Qualifications Held by Under-8 Practitioners in London

N=265

Age Range	
0-3	2.1%
0-5	5.2%
5-8	0.3%
3-8	1.6%

Figure 52 Proportion of Under-8 Practitioners in London Re-trained to Work with Children Under-8 According to Specific Age Ranges

N= 265

	Roles						
Qualifications	**Teachers**	**Support Teachers**	**Nursery Nurses**	**Nursery Workers**	**Classroom Assistants**	**Playgroup Assistants**	**Others**
BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd	13.10%	0.99%	0.55%	0.11%	0.22%	-	0.11%
BA	3.41%	0.22%	-	0.04%	0.11%	0.22%	0.04%
BSc	0.99%	0.03%	0.03%	0.11%	-	0.06%	0.04%
NNEB/City & Guilds	2.09%	0.44%	15.53%	1.87%	0.88%	1.76%	0.22%
SRN	0.44%	0.01%	-	0.11%	0.02%	0.11%	0.03%
PGCE	3.08%	0.22%	0.02%	-	-	0.06%	-
NVQs	0.22%	-	-	0.11%	-	-	0.11%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.99%	0.03%	-	-	-	-	0.02%
MPhil/PhD	0.11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BTech	0.11%	-	0.22%	0.06%	-	-	-
Cert.Ed. (2 Years)	1.76%	0.11%	-	0.01%	-	0.03%	-
Cert.Ed. (3 Years)	10.13%	0.66%	-	-	0.03%	0.11%	0.04%
Montessori Certificate	1.98%	0.22%	0.55%	0.02%	0.11%	0.33%	-
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice	0.11%	0.22%	0.33%	1.10%	0.11%	7.05%	0.11%
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course	-	-	-	0.11%	-	0.33%	-
PPA Short Courses	0.77%	0.11%	0.33%	0.44%	0.33%	4.63%	0.11%
PPA Further Course	0.03%	-	-	0.11%	0.11%	1.21%	-
None	0.17%	0.04%	0.33%	0.77%	4.07%	1.65%	3.08%
Other Qualifications	2.86%	0.11%	0.77%	0.33%	0.77%	1.10%	0.88%

Figure 53 Qualifications & Roles Held by Under-8 Practitioners in London

5.3 AGE RANGES FOR WHICH QUALIFIED TEACHERS WORKING WITH UNDER-8s WERE INITIALLY TRAINED (Figures 54 and 55)

- Only a quarter (25 percent) of qualified teachers were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which only a third (32.8 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further small proportion (9.3 percent) of qualified teachers had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Just under half (46 percent) of qualified teachers were trained initially through a Certificate of Education, of which just over a fifth (20.7 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Over a third (36.9 percent) of qualified teachers were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which less than a third (27.1 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just a tenth (10.4 percent) of qualified teachers were initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which just over a fifth (23.1 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Over three-fifths (65.7 percent) of qualified teachers working in the early years have had no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=360

Age Range	
3-5	8.2%
3-8	16.8%
5-7	9.5%
3-11	9.3%
5-11	29.7%
7-11	10.2%
11-16	9.7%
Others	6.6%

Figure 54 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained

N=360

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	2.0%	0.9%	2.7%	2.6%
3-8	8.0%	1.5%	6.8%	0.5%
5-7	2.4%	0.7%	6.5%	0.0%
3-11	4.8%	0.9%	3.6%	0.1%
5-11	11.1%	2.9%	15.3%	0.5%
7-11	3.7%	0.9%	5.3%	0.3%
11-16	3.2%	1.9%	4.3%	0.3%
Others	1.7%	0.7%	1.5%	2.7%

Figure 55 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.3.1 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision

The following sections present the findings on the age ranges for which qualified teachers working with under-8s were initially trained in Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools, Local Authority Day Nurseries, Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups.

5.3.1.1 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Nursery Schools were Initially Trained (Figures 56 and 57)

- Over half (57.1 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Nursery Schools were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which just over a tenth (11.9 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further one in ten (10.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Nursery Schools had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Less than one in two (47.1 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Nursery Schools was initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which just under half (48.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just under two-fifths (38.4 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Nursery Schools were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which over two-thirds (71.9 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Only one in ten (10 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Nursery Schools was initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which over half (58 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Nearly a third (32 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Nursery Schools have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=80

Age Range	
3-5	6.8%
3-8	50.3%
5-7	6.0%
3-11	10.9%
5-11	11.5%
7-11	4.4%
11-16	4.9%
Others	5.2%

Figure 56 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Nursery Schools were Initially Trained

5.3.1.2 **Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Infants/First Schools were Initially Trained** (Figures 58 and 59)

- Three out of ten (30.8 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Infant/First Schools were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which a third (33.8 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further one in eight (13.1 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Infant/First Schools had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Over half (53.1 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Infant/First Schools were initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which three out of ten (29.9 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

N=80

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	1.9%	0.3%	4.4%	0.3%
3-8	25.7%	5.5%	18.6%	0.6%
5-7	0.3%	-	5.7%	-
3-11	6.6%	1.1%	3.3%	-
5-11	1.6%	0.6%	8.2%	1.1%
7-11	1.4%	0.3%	2.5%	0.3%
11-16	0.6%	0.8%	3.6%	-
Others	0.3%	1.4%	0.8%	2.7%

Figure 57 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Nursery Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

- More than one in three (37.6 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Infant/First Schools were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which a third (33.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Less than a tenth (7.6 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Infant/First Schools were initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which over a quarter (27.6 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Over half (56.1 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Infant/First Schools have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

5.3.1.3 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools were Initially Trained (Figures 60 and 61)

- Only a tenth (11.6 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Primary Schools were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which just over a fifth (22.4 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further small proportion (8.4 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Primary Schools had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

N=63

Age Range	
3-5	10.4%
3-8	20.4%
5-7	19.9%
3-11	13.1%
5-11	24.8%
7-11	5.3%
11-16	3.0%
Others	3.1%

Figure 58 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Infants/First Schools were Initially Trained

N=63

Age Range	**BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd**	**PGCE**	**Cert.Ed.**	**Others**
3-5	5.1%	0.8%	4.5%	-
3-8	7.6%	1.3%	11.4%	0.1%
5-7	4.8%	1.8%	13.2%	-
3-11	6.1%	0.7%	6.3%	-
5-11	10.4%	1.3%	13.1%	-
7-11	2.5%	0.2%	2.5%	0.2%
11-16	0.3%	0.5%	1.8%	0.3%
Others	0.8%	1.0%	0.3%	1.0%

Figure 59 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Infants/First Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

- Just over two-fifths (43.3 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Primary Schools were initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which less than a tenth (8.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just over two-fifths (43.4 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Primary Schools were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which only one in seven (15.2 percent) was initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just over a tenth (12.8 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Primary Schools were initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which one in ten (10.2 percent) was initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Four out of five (80 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Primary Schools have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=75

Age Range	
3-5	2.6%
3-8	9.0%
5-7	8.0%
3-11	8.4%
5-11	50.5%
7-11	16.2%
11-16	3.3%
Others	2.0%

Figure 60 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools were Initially Trained

N=75

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	1.2%	0.4%	1.1%	-
3-8	5.4%	0.9%	2.7%	-
5-7	3.6%	0.8%	3.6%	-
3-11	5.0%	0.7%	2.5%	0.1%
5-11	20.6%	7.3%	22.6%	0.1%
7-11	5.6%	2.3%	8.2%	0.1%
11-16	1.1%	0.1%	2.1%	-
Others	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%

Figure 61 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.3.1.4 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools were Initially Trained (Figures 62 and 63)

- Just over a tenth (11.2 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Special Schools were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which less than half (47.3 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further one in ten (10 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Special Schools had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Just over two-fifths (42.3 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Special Schools were initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which less than a tenth (8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Two out of five (40.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Special Schools were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which less than a tenth (9.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Less than a tenth (7.9 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Special Schools were initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which just over a fifth (21.5 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- More than three out of four (78.8 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Special Schools have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=49

Age Range	
3-5	5.3%
3-8	5.9%
5-7	5.5%
3-11	10.0%
5-11	21.4%
7-11	9.4%
11-16	24.4%
Others	18.1%

Figure 62 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools were Initially Trained

N=49

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	1.0%	0.1%	2.2%	2.1%
3-8	3.0%	1.6%	1.2%	-
5-7	1.5%	-	4.0%	-
3-11	4.8%	0.8%	4.4%	-
5-11	10.3%	-	11.1%	-
7-11	2.6%	0.4%	6.0%	0.4%
11-16	11.0%	4.9%	8.5%	-
Others	6.7%	0.1%	4.9%	6.3%

Figure 63 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.3.1.5 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were Initially Trained (Figures 64 and 65)

- Just over one in three (34.8 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which over half (52.3 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further one in ten (10.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Approximately one in five (19.6 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries was initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which just a fifth (20.4 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Four out of five (80.4 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which less than two-fifths (38.3 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- In this survey, none of the qualified teachers working with under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries was initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

- More than one in two (54.3 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries have no specific initial training for working with under-5s, although all of these were initially trained in the 5-11 age phase.

N=5

Age Range	
3-5	18.2%
3-8	16.6%
5-7	-
3-11	10.9%
5-11	54.3%
7-11	-
11-16	-
Others	-

Figure 64 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were Initially Trained

N=5

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	18.2%	-	-	-
3-8	12.6%	-	4.0%	-
5-7	-	-	-	-
3-11	10.9%	-	-	-
5-11	38.7%	-	15.6%	-
7-11	-	-	-	-
11-16	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-

Figure 65 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Local Authority Day Nurseries were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.3.1.6 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were Initially Trained (Figures 66 and 67)

- Only one in seven (15.1 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools was initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which over a third (37.1 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further very small proportion (5.5 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- One in two (50.5 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools was initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which less than a tenth (8.7 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Over a quarter (28.7 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which less than a fifth (17.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Less than a tenth (8.6 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which a very small proportion (3.5 percent) was initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Approximately four out of five (79.4 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=48

Age Range	
3-5	5.6%
3-8	9.5%
5-7	6.6%
3-11	5.5%
5-11	35.2%
7-11	15.6%
11-16	16.7%
Others	5.3%

Figure 66 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were Initially Trained

N=48

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	1.0%	-	1.0%	3.6%
3-8	4.1%	0.3%	3.4%	1.7%
5-7	1.4%	-	5.2%	-
3-11	2.7%	0.6%	2.0%	0.3%
5-11	8.1%	3.1%	22.2%	1.8%
7-11	6.3%	0.6%	8.0%	0.7%
11-16	4.5%	3.4%	6.7%	2.1%
Others	0.6%	0.6%	2.0%	2.1%

Figure 67 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.3.1.7 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were Initially Trained (Figures 68 and 69)

- More than one in two (53.5 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which over three-quarters (76.1 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further small proportion (8.1 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Less than one in two (45.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools was initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which just over two-fifths (43.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Less than a tenth (7.4 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which just a quarter (25.7 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Only one in seven (14.6 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools was initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which nearly three-quarters (74.7 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Over a third (38.4 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=19

Age Range	
3-5	40.7%
3-8	12.8%
5-7	14.4%
3-11	8.1%
5-11	6.8%
7-11	0.5%
11-16	6.6%
Others	10.1%

Figure 68 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were Initially Trained

N=19

Age Range	**BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd**	**PGCE**	**Cert.Ed.**	**Others**
3-5	-	10.9%	9.2%	20.6%
3-8	1.9%	-	10.9%	-
5-7	0,7%	0.9%	12.8%	-
3-11	1.4%	2.3%	4.5%	-
5-11	2.4%	0.5%	2.4%	1.4%
7-11	-	-	0.5%	-
11-16	1.0%	-	5.6%	-
Others	-	-	-	10.1%

Figure 69 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Nursery Schools were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.3.1.8 **Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were Initially Trained** (Figures 70 and 71)

- Two out of three (66.7 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which seven out of ten (71.7 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further one in eight (13.4 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Just over a tenth (13.5 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which just under half (48.1 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- More than a quarter (27.9 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which four out of five (80.3 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just over a tenth (12.4 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which all were initially trained in the 3-11 age phase.

- Approximately one in five (19.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries has no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=10

Age Range	
3-5	47.8%
3-8	18.9%
5-7	6.5%
3-11	13.4%
5-11	-
7-11	1.5%
11-16	3.5%
Others	8.4%

Figure 70 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were Initially Trained

5.3.1.9 **Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Playgroups were Initially Trained** (Figures 72 and 73)

- More than one in four (26.8 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Playgroups were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which just over a quarter (26.1 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

N=10

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	7.0%	-	3.0%	37.8%
3-8	15.4%	-	3.5%	-
5-7	-	-	6.5%	-
3-11	0.5%	12.4%	0.5%	-
5-11	-	-	-	-
7-11	1.5%	-	-	-
11-16	3.5%	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	8.5%

Figure 71 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Private and Workplace Nurseries were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

- Just under one in five (19.3 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Playgroups was initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which just over a fifth (22.3 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just under two-fifths (38.5 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Playgroups were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which around a quarter (24.9 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Three out of ten (29.5 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Playgroups were initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which none was initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Nearly three-quarters (73.2 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Playgroups have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

5.3.2 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s were Initially Trained in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Provisions

The following sections present the findings on the age ranges for which qualified teachers working with under-8s were initially trained in State-Maintained (this includes: Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries) and Non-Maintained (this includes: Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups) sectors of under-8 provision.

N=11

Age Range	
3-5	7.0%
3-8	19.8%
5-7	-
3-11	-
5-11	23.5%
7-11	6.9%
11-16	36.9%
Others	5.9%

Figure 72 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Playgroups were Initially Trained

N=11

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	-	-	-	6.9%
3-8	9.6%	-	4.3%	5.9%
5-7	-	-	-	-
3-11	-	-	-	-
5-11	5.9%	2.7%	15.0%	-
7-11	7.0%	-	-	-
11-16	16.0%	20.9%	-	-
Others	-	5.9%	-	-

Figure 73 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with under-8s in Playgroups were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.3.2.1 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in State-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained (Figures 74 and 75)

- Less than one in four (24.4 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in state-maintained provision was initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which just under a quarter (24.2 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further one in ten (10.5 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in state-maintained provision had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Less than one in two (45.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in state-maintained provision was initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which just over a fifth (21.6 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Around two out of five (40.8 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in state-maintained provision were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which just over a quarter (28.2 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Only one in ten (9.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in state-maintained provision was initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which just under a quarter (23.2 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Nearly two-thirds (65.2 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in state-maintained provision have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=272

Age Range	
3-5	5.9%
3-8	18.5%
5-7	9.8%
3-11	10.5%
5-11	31.0%
7-11	9.8%
11-16	8.2%
Others	6.4%

Figure 74 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in State-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained

5.3.2.2 **Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Non-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained** (Figures 76 and 77)

- More than a quarter (26.3 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in non-maintained provision were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which over half (57.8 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

- A further small proportion (6.1 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in non-maintained provision had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

N=272

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	2.4%	0.3%	2.7%	0.5%
3-8	9.1%	2.0%	7.2%	0.2%
5-7	2.7%	0.7%	6.4%	-
3-11	5.6%	0.8%	4.0%	0.1%
5-11	12.6%	3.0%	15.2%	0.2%
7-11	3.4%	1.0%	5.2%	0.2%
11-16	3.0%	1.4%	3.7%	0.1%
Others	2.0%	0.7%	1.5%	2.2%

Figure 75 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with under-8s in State-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

- Less than one in two (46.8 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in non-maintained provision was initially trained through a Certificate of Education, of which under a fifth (17.3 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just under a quarter (24.2 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in non-maintained provision were initially trained through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which over a fifth (21.5 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Only one in ten (10.9 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in non-maintained provisions was initially trained through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), of which around a quarter (24.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- More than two-thirds (67.6 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in non-maintained provision have no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

5.3.3. **Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in London were Initially Trained** (Figures 78 and 79)

Finally, the age ranges for which qualified teachers working with under-8s in all institutions in the state-maintained, independent and voluntary sectors that were surveyed in the London area are reported.

- Just over a quarter (25.7 percent) of qualified teachers in London were initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which just over a third (35.8 percent) were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.

N=88

Age Range	
3-5	15.2%
3-8	11.1%
5-7	8.1%
3-11	6.1%
5-11	27.1%
7-11	11.3%
11-16	14.7%
Others	6.4%

Figure 76 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Non-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained

N=88

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	0.9%	2.5%	2.9%	9.0%
3-8	4.3%	0.2%	5.2%	1.4%
5-7	1.1%	0.2%	6.8%	-
3-11	2.2%	1.4%	2.3%	0.2%
5-11	6.5%	2.3%	16.7%	1.6%
7-11	4.7%	0.4%	5.7%	0.5%
11-16	4.1%	3.2%	5.9%	1.4%
Others	0.4%	0.7%	1.3%	4.1%

Figure 77 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Non-Maintained Provision were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

- A further tenth (9.8 percent) of qualified teachers in London had a form of initial training which included some work with under-5s.

- Over a third (38 percent) of qualified teachers in London were trained initially through a Certificate of Education, of which only a seventh (14.5 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Over two-fifths (42.9 percent) of qualified teachers in London were trained initially through a first degree in Education (BA(Ed)/BEd/BAdd), of which just under a third (30.8 percent) were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- Just over a tenth (10.3 percent) of qualified teachers in London were trained initially through a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), and just over a fifth (21.4 percent) of these were initially trained in the 3-8 age phase.

- The majority (64.5 percent) of qualified teachers working in the early years in London have had no specific initial training for working with under-5s.

N=162

Age Range	
3-5	9.2%
3-8	16.5%
5-7	8.3%
3-11	9.8%
5-11	31.0%
7-11	9.0%
11-16	9.7%
Others	6.5%

Figure 78 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in London were Initially Trained

N=162

Age Range	BA(Ed)/BEd/ BAdd	PGCE	Cert.Ed.	Others
3-5	2.7%	0.5%	1.5%	4.5%
3-8	10.5%	1.7%	4.0%	0.3%
5-7	2.7%	1.0%	4.7%	0.0%
3-11	5.3%	1.2%	3.2%	0.2%
5-11	11.7%	3.2%	15.2%	1.0%
7-11	4.5%	0.7%	3.7%	0.2%
11-16	4.0%	1.3%	4.0%	0.3%
Others	1.5%	0.7%	1.7%	2.7%

Figure 79 Age Ranges for which Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in London were Initially Trained through Specific Courses

5.4 FURTHER STUDY UNDERTAKEN BY QUALIFIED TEACHERS (Figure 80)

- Under a sixth (15.5 percent) of qualified teachers working in the early years have engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (2.8 percent) of qualified teachers has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which almost all (92.9 percent) have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=360

In-service BEd	2.7%
Professional Diploma	4.9%
MA/MEd/MAdd	2.6%
MPhil/PhD	0.2%
Others	5.1%

Figure 80 Proportion of Qualified Teachers who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision

The following sections present the findings on further study undertaken by qualified teachers in Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools, Local Authority Day Nurseries, Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups.

5.4.1.1 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Nursery Schools (Figure 81)

- More than one in three (36.4 percent) qualified teachers working in Nursery Schools have engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- Under a tenth (8.8 percent) of qualified teachers in Nursery Schools have undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which almost all (96.6 percent) have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=80

In-service BEd	3.3%
Professional Diploma	10.9%
MA/MEd/MAdd	8.5%
MPhil/PhD	0.3%
Others	13.4%

Figure 81 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Nursery Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1.2 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Infant/First Schools (Figure 82)

- Just over one in ten (13.3 percent) qualified teachers working in Infant/First Schools have engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (2.2 percent) of qualified teachers in Infant/First Schools has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which all have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=63

In-service BEd	3.3%
Professional Diploma	5.5%
MA/MEd/MAdd	2.2%
MPhil/PhD	-
Others	2.3%

Figure 82 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Infant/First Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1.3 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools (Figure 83)

- Less than one in ten (8.5 percent) qualified teachers working with under-8s in Primary Schools has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- An extremely small proportion (0.9 percent) of qualified teachers who are working with under-8s in Primary Schools has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which over four-fifths (88.9 percent) have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=75

In-service BEd	2.0%
Professional Diploma	3.7%
MA/MEd/MAdd	0.8%
MPhil/PhD	0.1%
Others	1.9%

Figure 83 Proportion of Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Primary Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1.4 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools (Figure 84)

- Approximately one in five (19.9 percent) qualified teachers working in the early years in Special Schools has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (1.8 percent) of qualified teachers working with under-8s in Special Schools has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which two-thirds (66.7 percent) have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=49

In-service BEd	4.9%
Professional Diploma	5.8%
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.2%
MPhil/PhD	0.6%
Others	7.4%

Figure 84 Proportion of Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Special Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1.5 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Local Authority Day Nurseries (Figure 85)

- Less than one in ten (9.3 percent) qualified teachers in Local Authority Day Nurseries working in the early years has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education, of which all have undertaken further study for a Professional Diploma.

N=5

In-service BEd	-
Professional Diploma	9.3%
MA/MEd/MAdd	-
MPhil/PhD	-
Others	-

Figure 85 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Local Authority Day Nurseries who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1.6 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools (Figure 86)

- Roughly one in twenty (5.2 percent) qualified teachers working in the early years in Independent Preparatory Schools has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (2.4 percent) of qualified teachers who are working with under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which all have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

5.4.1.7 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Independent Nursery Schools (Figure 87)

- One in five (20.7 percent) qualified teachers working in Independent Nursery Schools has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (2.8 percent) of qualified teachers in Independent Nursery Schools has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which all have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=48

In-service BEd	-
Professional Diploma	1.1%
MA/MEd/MAdd	2.4%
MPhil/PhD	-
Others	1.7%

Figure 86 Proportion of Qualified Teachers Working with Under-8s in Independent Preparatory Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

N=19

In-service BEd	3.0%
Professional Diploma	3.6%
MA/MEd/MAdd	2.8%
MPhil/PhD	-
Others	11.3%

Figure 87 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Independent Nursery Schools who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1.8 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Private and Workplace Nurseries (Figure 88)

- Around one in seven (14.5 percent) qualified teachers in Private and Workplace Nurseries working in the early years has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (4.5 percent) of qualified teachers in Private and Workplace Nurseries has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which almost all have undertaken further study for a Doctorate or other research degree.

N=10

In-service BEd	-
Professional Diploma	5.5%
MA/MEd/MAdd	-
MPhil/PhD	4.5%
Others	4.5%

Figure 88 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Private & Workplace Nurseries who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.1.9 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Playgroups (Figure 89)

- Approximately one in four (25.2 percent) qualified teachers in Playgroups working in the early years has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education, of which over a quarter (27.8 percent) have undertaken further study for an In-service BEd degree and none has undertaken further study for higher degrees.

N=11

In-service BEd	7.0%
Professional Diploma	-
MA/MEd/MAdd	-
MPhil/PhD	-
Others	18.2%

Figure 89 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Playgroups who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.2 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

The following sections present the findings on further study undertaken by qualified teachers in State-Maintained (this includes: Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries) and Non-Maintained (this includes: Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups) sectors of under-8 provision.

5.4.2.1 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions (Figure 90)

- Less than one in five (17.1 percent) qualified teachers in state-maintained under-8 provisions has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (2.8 percent) of qualified teachers in state-maintained under-8 provisions has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which the vast majority (89.3 percent) has undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=272

In-service BEd	3.2%
Professional Diploma	5.9%
MA/MEd/MAdd	2.5%
MPhil/PhD	0.3%
Others	5.2%

Figure 90 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.2.2 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions (Figure 91)

- Less than one in ten (8.8 percent) qualified teachers in non-maintained under-8 provisions working in the early years has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (1.8 percent) of qualified teachers in non-maintained under-8 provisions has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which the vast majority (88.9 percent) has undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=88

In-service BEd	1.1%
Professional Diploma	1.6%
MA/MEd/MAdd	1.6%
MPhil/PhD	0.2%
Others	4.3%

Figure 91 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in Non-maintained Under-8 Provisions who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.4.3 Further Study Undertaken by Qualified Teachers in London (Figure 92)

- Only a seventh (14.1 percent) of qualified teachers working in the early years in London have engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.

- A very small proportion (3.2 percent) of qualified teachers in London has undertaken further study for higher degrees, of which almost all (93.8 percent) have undertaken further study for a Masters' degree.

N=162

In-service BEd	1.8%
Professional Diploma	4.3%
MA/MEd/MAdd	3.0%
MPhil/PhD	0.2%
Others	4.8%

Figure 92 Proportion of Qualified Teachers in London who have Engaged in Further Study Related to Early Childhood Education

5.5 FACTORS THAT SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN APPROPRIATE CURRICULUM FOR YOUNG CHILDREN (Figure 93)

In this main section the responses of heads of institutions for under-8s to an invitation to place in order of importance factors that support the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children are reported. Some key findings from the overall responses are reported first.

- *"The Qualities of Staff"*, *"Effective Partnership with Parents"* and *"The Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 74.2 percent, 72.1 percent and 63.2 percent of heads of institutions respectively.

- Factors like the *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (7.2 percent), *"Evaluating Provision"* (11.1 percent), *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (13.6 percent) and *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (13.4 percent), on the other hand, were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum.

- *"A High Ratio of Staff to Children"* was seen as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum by playgroup leaders (57.4 percent) and by heads of nurseries in the independent sector (heads of independent nursery schools (62.5 percent) and heads of private and workplace nurseries (64.7 percent)).

N=544

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	25.6%
Range of experience of staff	27.8%
Length of experience of staff	7.2%
Qualities of staff	74.2%
Provision for staff development & INSET	25.3%
Evaluating Provision	11.1%
Keeping records of children's learning	22.5%
Assessment of children	24.7%
Effective partnership with parents	72.1%
High ratio of staff to children	43.4%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	63.2%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	13.6%
A supportive social environment	13.4%
High quality resources for early learning	32.8%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	25.2%
Management structure of the institution/group	19.1%

Figure 93 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Different Types of Institutions for Under-8s to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

The following sections present the findings from different sectors of provision on the factors considered by heads of institutions to be most significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children. These sectors include Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools, Local Authority Day Nurseries, Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups.

5.5.1.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 94)

- *"Effective Partnership with Parents"*, *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* and *"Qualities of Staff"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 77.8 percent, 74.4 percent and 65.6 percent of heads of Nursery Schools respectively.

- Factors like *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (1.1 percent), *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (5.6 percent) and *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* (5.6 percent) were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Nursery Schools.

- Over half of Nursery School heads (51.1 percent) also considered *"Qualifications of Staff"* to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- More than two out of five heads of Nursery Schools (42.2 percent) considered *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* to be very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* and *"Assessment of Children"* were also seen as very significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over a third of heads of Nursery Schools (36.7 percent and 33.3 percent respectively).

- Over a fifth of heads of Nursery Schools also considered factors like *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* (28.9 percent), *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* (26.7 percent), *"Evaluating Provision"* (20 percent) and *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (20 percent) to be quite significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* and *"Range of Experience of Staff"* were only considered to be highly significant by approximately a tenth of heads of Nursery Schools (11.1 percent and 10 percent).

N=90

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	51.1%
Range of experience of staff	10.0%
Length of experience of staff	1.1%
Qualities of staff	65.6%
Provision for staff development & INSET	42.2%
Evaluating Provision	20.0%
Keeping records of children's learning	36.7%
Assessment of children	33.3%
Effective partnership with parents	77.8%
High ratio of staff to children	26.7%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	74.4%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	11.1%
A supportive social environment	5.6%
High quality resources for early learning	28.9%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	5.6%
Management structure of the institution/group	20.0%

Figure 94 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.1.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 95)

- *"Provision of An Effective Environment for Learning"*, *"Qualities of Staff"* and *"Effective Partnership with Parents"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 86.1 percent, 83.3 percent and 73.6 percent of heads of Infant/First Schools respectively.

- *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (1.4 percent), however, was considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- Over half of heads of Infant/First Schools (51.4 percent) considered the factor *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* was also seen by over two-fifths (44.4 percent) of heads of Infant/First Schools to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Approximately one in five heads of Infant/First Schools considered factors like *"Qualifications of Staff"* (23.6 percent), *"Assessment of Children"* (23.6 percent), *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* (20.8 percent) and *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (19.4 percent) to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around a tenth of heads of Infant/First Schools also considered factors like *"Range of Experience of Staff"* (16.7 percent), *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (13.9 percent), *"Evaluating Provision"* (12.5 percent), *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (11.1 percent), *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (11.1 percent), and *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (9.7 percent) to be quite significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=72

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	23.6%
Range of experience of staff	16.7%
Length of experience of staff	1.4%
Qualities of staff	83.3%
Provision for staff development & INSET	19.4%
Evaluating Provision	12.5%
Keeping records of children's learning	11.1%
Assessment of children	23.6%
Effective partnership with parents	73.6%
High ratio of staff to children	44.4%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	86.1%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	11.1%
A supportive social environment	9.7%
High quality resources for early learning	51.4%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	20.8%
Management structure of the institution/group	13.9%

Figure 95 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.1.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 96)

- *"Qualities of Staff"*, *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Early Learning"* and *"Effective Partnership with Parents"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 85.2 percent, 72.7 percent and 71.6 percent of heads of Primary Schools respectively.

- *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (4.5 percent), on the other hand, was considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by of heads of Primary Schools.

- Over two-fifths (43.2 percent) of heads of Primary Schools also considered the factor *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- More than one out of four heads of Primary Schools considered factors like *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* (30.7 percent), *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* (28.4 percent), *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (27.3 percent), and *"Qualifications of Staff"* (26.1 percent) to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Assessment of Children"* and *"Management Structure of the Institution"* were also seen by over a fifth (22.7 percent) of heads of Primary Schools to be very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around a tenth of heads of Primary Schools also considered factors like *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (17 percent), *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (17 percent), *"Range of Experience of Staff"* (15.9 percent), *"Evaluating Provision"* (12.5 percent), and *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Early Learning"* (11.4 percent) to be quite significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

5.5.1.4 Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 97)

- *"Qualities of Staff"*, *"Effective Partnership with Parents"*, and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Early Learning"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 78.3 percent, 71.7 percent and 65 percent of heads of Special Schools respectively.

- Factors like *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (3.3 percent) and *"Evaluating Provision"* (3.3 percent) were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Special Schools.

N=88

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	26.1%
Range of experience of staff	15.9%
Length of experience of staff	4.5%
Qualities of staff	85.2%
Provision for staff development & INSET	27.3%
Evaluating Provision	12.5%
Keeping records of children's learning	17.0%
Assessment of children	22.7%
Effective partnership with parents	71.6%
High ratio of staff to children	43.2%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	72.7%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	11.4%
A supportive social environment	17.0%
High quality resources for early learning	30.7%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	28.4%
Management structure of the institution/group	22.7%

Figure 96 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

- More than two out of five heads of Special Schools (43.3 percent) considered *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* to be very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around a third of heads of Special Schools also considered factors like *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* (35 percent) and *"Assessment of Children"* (31.7 percent) to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- More than one out of four heads of Special Schools also considered factors like *"Range of Experience of Staff"* (28.3 percent), *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* (28.3 percent), and *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (26.7 percent) to be very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Qualifications of Staff"* and *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* were also seen by over a fifth of heads of Special Schools to be very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Over a tenth of heads of Special Schools also considered factors like *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (18.3 percent), *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (11.7 percent), and *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* to be quite significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=60

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	23.3%
Range of experience of staff	28.3%
Length of experience of staff	3.3%
Qualities of staff	78.3%
Provision for staff development & INSET	43.3%
Evaluating Provision	3.3%
Keeping records of children's learning	26.7%
Assessment of children	31.7%
Effective partnership with parents	71.7%
High ratio of staff to children	28.3%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	65.0%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	10.0%
A supportive social environment	11.7%
High quality resources for early learning	35.0%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	21.7%
Management structure of the institution/group	18.3%

Figure 97 Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.1.5 **Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children** (Figure 98)

- *"Effective Partnership with Parents"* and *"Qualities of Staff"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 81 percent and 61.9 percent of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries respectively.

- Factors like *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (0 percent) and *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (4.8 percent), however, were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Over half (57.1 percent) of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries also considered factors like *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* was also seen by over a third (38.1 percent) of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around one in four heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries also considered factors like *"Qualifications of Staff"* (28.6 percent), *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (28.6 percent), *"Assessment of Children"* (28.6 percent), *"Range of Experience of Staff"* (23.8 percent), and *"Evaluating Provision"* (23.8 Percent) to be very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Over a tenth (14.3 percent) of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries also considered factors like *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"*, *"A Supportive Social Environment"*, *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"*, and *"Management Structure of the Institution"* to be quite significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=21

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	28.6%
Range of experience of staff	23.8%
Length of experience of staff	-
Qualities of staff	61.9%
Provision for staff development & INSET	57.1%
Evaluating Provision	23.8%
Keeping records of children's learning	28.6%
Assessment of children	28.6%
Effective partnership with parents	81.0%
High ratio of staff to children	14.3%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	57.1%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	4.8%
A supportive social environment	14.3%
High quality resources for early learning	38.1%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	14.3%
Management structure of the institution/group	14.3%

Figure 98 Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.1.6 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 99)

- More than nine in ten (91.8 percent) heads of Independent Preparatory Schools cited *"Qualities of Staff"* as the single most significant factor in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Effective Partnership with Parents"* and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were cited as highly significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by nearly two-thirds of heads of Independent Preparatory Schools (65.6 percent and 62.3 percent respectively).

- Factors like *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (8.2 percent), *"Evaluating Provision"* (8.2 Percent), *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (9.8 percent), and *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (9.8 percent), however, were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Independent Preparatory Schools.

- About half (49.2 percent) of heads of Independent Preparatory Schools also considered the factor *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Range of Experience of Staff"* and *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* were also seen as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by about two-thirds of heads of Independent Preparatory Schools (36.1 percent and 32.8 percent respectively).

- Approximately one in four heads of Independent Preparatory Schools also considered factors like *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* (27.9 percent), *"Assessment of Children"* (26.2 percent), and *"Qualifications of Staff"* (24.6 percent) to be very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- More than one in seven heads of Independent Preparatory Schools also considered factors like *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (16.4 percent), *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (14.8 percent), and *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (14.8 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=61

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	24.6%
Range of experience of staff	36.1%
Length of experience of staff	9.8%
Qualities of staff	91.8%
Provision for staff development & INSET	8.2%
Evaluating Provision	8.2%
Keeping records of children's learning	16.4%
Assessment of children	26.2%
Effective partnership with parents	65.6%
High ratio of staff to children	49.2%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	62.3%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	9.8%
A supportive social environment	14.8%
High quality resources for early learning	27.9%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	32.8%
Management structure of the institution/group	14.8%

Figure 99 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.1.7 **Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children** (Figure 100)

- *"Qualities of Staff"*, *"Effective Partnership with Parents"* and *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 75 percent, 70.8 percent and 62.5 percent of heads of Independent Nursery Schools respectively.

- Factors like *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (4.2 percent), *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (8.3 percent), and *"Evaluating Provision"* (8.3 percent) were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

- *"Range of Experience of Staff"* and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were also seen by a third (33.3 percent) of heads of Independent Nursery Schools as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around a quarter of heads of Independent Nursery Schools also considered factors like *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (29.2 percent), *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (29.2 percent), *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (29.2 percent), *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (25 percent), *"Assessment of Children"* (25 percent), *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* (25 percent), and *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* (25 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- One in six (16.7 percent) heads of Independent Nursery Schools also considered *"Qualifications of Staff"* as a highly significant factor in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=24

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	16.7%
Range of experience of staff	33.3%
Length of experience of staff	25.0%
Qualities of staff	75.0%
Provision for staff development & INSET	8.3%
Evaluating Provision	8.3%
Keeping records of children's learning	29.2%
Assessment of children	25.0%
Effective partnership with parents	70.8%
High ratio of staff to children	62.5%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	33.3%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	29.2%
A supportive social environment	4.2%
High quality resources for early learning	25.0%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	25.0%
Management structure of the institution/group	29.2%

Figure 100 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.1.8 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 101)

- *"Effective Partnership with Parents"*, *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"*, *"Qualities of Staff"*, and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by the majority of heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries (64.7 percent, 64.7 percent, 61.9 percent and 55.9 percent respectively).

- Factors like *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (5.9 percent) and *"Evaluating Provision"* (5.9 percent), however, were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

- Just over two-fifths (41.2 percent) of heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries also considered *"Range of Experience of Staff"* as a highly significant factor in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Nearly one in three (32.4 percent) heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries also considered factors like *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* and *"Adequate Number of resources for Early Learning"* as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"*, *"Management Structure of the Institution"* and *"Assessment of Children"* were also seen as highly significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over a fifth of heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries (23.5 percent, 23.5 percent and 20.6 percent respectively).

- More than one in seven heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries also considered factors like *"Qualifications of Staff"* (17.6 percent), *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (17.6 percent), *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (17.6 percent), and *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (14.7 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

5.5.1.9 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 102)

- *"Effective Partnership with Parents"*, *"Qualities of Staff"*, *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"*, and *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 72.3 percent, 64.9 percent, 61.7 percent and 57.4 percent of Leaders of Playgroups respectively.

N=34

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	17.6%
Range of experience of staff	41.2%
Length of experience of staff	5.9%
Qualities of staff	61.8%
Provision for staff development & INSET	14.7%
Evaluating Provision	5.9%
Keeping records of children's learning	32.4%
Assessment of children	20.6%
Effective partnership with parents	64.7%
High ratio of staff to children	64.7%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	55.9%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	17.6%
A supportive social environment	17.6%
High quality resources for early learning	23.5%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	32.4%
Management structure of the institution/group	23.5%

Figure 101 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

- Factors like *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (4.3 percent), *"Evaluating Provision"* (5.3 Percent), and *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (7.4 percent), however, were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by Leaders of Playgroups.

- More than two in five Leaders of Playgroups considered factors like *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* (45.7 percent) and *"Range of Experience of Staff"* (44.7 percent) as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* was also seen as a highly significant factor in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over a third (35.1 percent) of Leaders of Playgroups.

- Approximately a quarter (25.5 percent) of Leaders of Playgroups also considered *"A Supportive Social Environment"* as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- About one in five Leaders of Playgroups considered *"Qualifications of Staff"* as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around a tenth of Leaders of Playgroups also considered factors like *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (17 percent), *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (14.9 percent), *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (13.8 percent), and *"Assessment of Children"* (10.6 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=94

Supporting Factors:	
Qualifications of staff	19.1%
Range of experience of staff	44.7%
Length of experience of staff	13.8%
Qualities of staff	64.9%
Provision for staff development & INSET	7.4%
Evaluating Provision	5.3%
Keeping records of children's learning	4.3%
Assessment of children	10.6%
Effective partnership with parents	72.3%
High ratio of staff to children	57.4%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	61.7%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	17.0%
A supportive social environment	25.5%
High quality resources for early learning	35.1%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	45.7%
Management structure of the institution/group	14.9%

Figure 102 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

The following sections present the findings on the factors considered by heads of institutions to be most significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children in State-Maintained (this includes: Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries) and Non-Maintained (this includes: Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups) sectors of under-8 provision.

5.5.2.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 103)

- *"Effective Partnership with Parents"*, *"Qualities of Staff"* and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 75.1 percent, 74.9 percent and 71.1 percent of heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions.

- Factors like *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (2.1 percent) and "An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning" (9.7 percent), however, were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions.

- More than one in three heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (37.9 percent) and *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* (36.8 percent) as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"High Ratio of Staff to Children"* and *"Qualifications of Staff"* were also seen as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by about three in ten heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions (31.4 percent and 30.6 percent respectively).

- Around a quarter of heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Assessment of Children"* (28 percent) and *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (24 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- More than one in six heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Range of Experience of Staff"* (18.9 percent), *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* (18.2 percent), and *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (17.8 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Over a tenth of heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (14.4 percent) and *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (11.7 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=331

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	30.6%
Range of experience of staff	18.9%
Length of experience of staff	2.1%
Qualities of staff	74.9%
Provision for staff development & INSET	37.9%
Evaluating Provision	14.4%
Keeping records of children's learning	24.0%
Assessment of children	28.0%
Effective partnership with parents	75.1%
High ratio of staff to children	31.4%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	71.1%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	9.7%
A supportive social environment	11.7%
High quality resources for early learning	36.8%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	18.2%
Management structure of the institution/group	17.8%

Figure 103 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.2.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 104)

- *"Qualities of Staff"*, *"Effective Partnership with Parents"*, *"High Ration of Staff to Children"*, and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 73.4 percent, 68.4 percent, 58.5 percent and 53.3 percent of heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions respectively.

- Factors like *"Evaluating Provision"* (6.9 percent) and *"Provision for Staff Development & INSET"* (9.7 percent), however, were considered as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions.

- Over a third of heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Range of Experience of Staff"* (38.8 percent) and *"Adequate Number of Resources for Early Learning"* (34 percent) as highly significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"High Quality Resources for Early Learning"* was also seen as a highly significant factor in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over a quarter (27.9 percent) of heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions.

- Around one in five heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Qualifications of Staff"* (19.5 percent), *"Keeping Records of Children's Learning"* (20.5 percent), *"Assessment of Children"* (20.6 percent) and *"Management Structure of the Institution"* (20.6 percent) as very significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Length of Experience of Staff"*, *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"*, and *"A Supportive Social Environment"* were also seen as very significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 13.6 percent, 18.4 percent and 15.5 percent of heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions respectively.

N=213 p-value < 0.05

(98% confidence level, 8% margin of error)

Supporting Factors:	
Qualifications of staff	19.5%
Range of experience of staff	38.8%
Length of experience of staff	13.6%
Qualities of staff	73.4%
Provision for staff development & INSET	9.7%
Evaluating Provision	6.9%
Keeping records of children's learning	20.5%
Assessment of children	20.6%
Effective partnership with parents	68.4%
High ratio of staff to children	58.5%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	53.3%
An Adequate physical environment for learning	18.4%
A supportive social environment	15.5%
High quality resources for early learning	27.9%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	34.0%
Management structure of the institution/group	20.6%

Figure 104 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.5.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 105)

Finally, the views of heads of all institutions in the state-maintained, independent and voluntary sectors that were surveyed in the London area are reported.

- *"Effective Partnership with Parents"*, *"Qualities of Staff"* and *"Provision of an Effective Environment for Learning"* were cited as the most significant factors in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by the vast majority (74.1 percent, 72.7 percent and 61.1 percent respectively) of heads of institutions in London.

- Factors like the *"Length of Experience of Staff"* (9 percent), *"Evaluating Provision"* (11.6 percent), *"An Adequate Physical Environment for Learning"* (14.5 percent) and *"A Supportive Social Environment"* (14.9 percent), however, were considered by heads of institutions in London as not so significant in supporting the development of an appropriate curriculum.

N=271

Supporting Factors:

Qualifications of staff	25.6%
Range of experience of staff	26.3%
Length of experience of staff	9.0%
Qualities of staff	72.7%
Provision for staff development and INSET	27.5%
Evaluating Provision	11.6%
Keeping records of children's learning	25.5%
Assessment of children	25.7%
Effective partnership with parents	74.1%
High ratio of staff to children	39.1%
Provision of an effective environment for learning	61.1%
An adequate physical environment for learning	14.5%
A supportive social environment	14.9%
High quality resources for early learning	29.8%
Adequate number of resources for early learning	25.2%
Management structure of the institution/group	19.1%

Figure 105 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Supporting the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6 FACTORS THAT CONSTRAIN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN APPROPRIATE CURRICULUM FOR YOUNG CHILDREN (Figure 106)

In this main section the responses of heads of institutions for under-8s to an invitation to place in order of importance factors that constrain the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children are reported. Some key findings from the overall responses are reported first.

- *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* was considered to be the most constraining factor on the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by the majority of heads (62.9 percent) in all types of provision except state-maintained nursery schools.

- The majority (73.3 percent) of headteachers of nursery schools cited *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* as the most constraining factor.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* was considered to be the least constraining factor on the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions (12.5 percent).

- *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (60.3 percent) and *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (55.8 percent) were also considered as very significant factors in constraining the development of an appropriate [illegible]iculum for young children.

N=543

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	53.1%
Inexperienced Staff	41.7%
Inadequate levels of staffing	62.9%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	32.3%
Poor monitoring of provision	26.6%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	36.7%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	46.2%
Restricted space for learning	26.1%
Inappropriate accommodation	38.9%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	12.5%
Insufficient budget for resources	60.3%
Poor management of the institution	55.8%

Figure 106 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Different Types of Institutions for Under-8s to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

The following sections present the findings on the factors considered by heads of individual types of institutions to be most significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children. These include the views of heads of Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools, Local Authority Day Nurseries, Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and leaders of Playgroups.

5.6.1.1 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 107)

- *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"*, *"Poor Management of the Institution"* and *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* were cited as the most constraining factors on the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 73.3 percent, 66.7 percent and 65.6 percent of heads of Nursery Schools respectively.

- *"Inexperienced Staff"* (11.1 percent), on the other hand, was considered to be not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Nursery Schools.

- More than two in five (42.2 percent) heads of Nursery Schools also considered factors like *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* and *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Over a third of heads of Nursery Schools considered factors like *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (35.6 percent), *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (36.7 percent), *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* (36.7 percent), and *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (36.7 percent) as highly significant factors in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Restricted Space for Learning"* and *"Limited Opportunities for Learning out of Doors"* were also seen as very significant factors in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by 21.1 percent and 30 percent of heads of Nursery Schools respectively.

5.6.1.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 108)

- More than three in four (77.8 percent) heads of Infant/First Schools cited *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* as the single most significant factor that constrains the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=90

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	73.3%
Inexperienced Staff	11.1%
Inadequate levels of staffing	65.6%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	35.6%
Poor monitoring of provision	36.7%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	36.7%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	42.2%
Restricted space for learning	21.1%
Inappropriate accommodation	42.2%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	30.0%
Insufficient budget for resources	36.7%
Poor management of the institution	66.7%

Figure 107 Factors Considered by Heads of Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

- The majority of heads of Infant/First Schools also considered factors like *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (58.3 percent), *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (61.1 percent) and *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (61.1 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (5.6 percent), however, was considered to be not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- More than two in five heads of Infant/First Schools also considered factors like *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (48.6 percent) and *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (40.3 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* was considered as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over a third of heads of Infant/First Schools (37.5 percent).

- A quarter of heads of Infant/First Schools also considered factors like *"Inexperienced Staff"* (25 percent), *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (27.8 percent), *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (25 percent), and *"Restricted Space for Learning"* (29.2 percent) as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=69

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	58.3%
Inexperienced Staff	25.0%
Inadequate levels of staffing	77.8%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	27.8%
Poor monitoring of provision	25.0%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	37.5%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	48.6%
Restricted space for learning	29.2%
Inappropriate accommodation	40.3%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	5.6%
Insufficient budget for resources	61.1%
Poor management of the institution	61.1%

Figure 108 Factors Considered by Heads of Infant/First Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.1.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 109)

- *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* was cited as the single most significant factor that constrains the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by seven out of ten (72.7 percent) heads of Primary Schools.

- The majority of heads of Primary Schools also considered factors like *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* (62.5 percent), *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (56.8 percent), and *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (52.3 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (2.3 percent), however, was considered as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Primary Schools.

- More than two in five heads of Primary Schools also considered factors like *"Inexperienced Staff"* (42 percent), *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (42 percent), and *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (43.2 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* was also considered by over a third (37.5 percent) of heads of Primary Schools as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- About three in ten heads of Primary Schools also considered factors like *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (29.5 percent) and *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (30.7 percent) as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Restricted Space for Learning"* was also seen as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by just over a fifth (20.5 percent) of heads of Primary Schools.

N=87

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialise	56.8%
Inexperienced Staff	42.0%
Inadequate levels of staffing	62.5%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	29.5%
Poor monitoring of provision	30.7%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	37.5%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	52.3%
Restricted space for learning	20.5%
Inappropriate accommodation	42.0%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	2.3%
Insufficient budget for resources	72.7%
Poor management of the institution	43.2%

Figure 109 Factors Considered by Heads of Primary Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.1.4 Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 110)

- *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* was cited as the single most significant factor that constrains the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by about two-thirds (65 percent) of heads of Special Schools.

- The majority of heads of Special Schools also considered factors like *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (55 percent), *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (53.3 percent), and *"Inexperienced Staff"* (50 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (10 percent), on the other hand, was seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- More than two in five heads of Special Schools considered factors like *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (46.7 percent), *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* (43.3 percent), *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (41.7 Percent), *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (41.7 percent), and *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (40 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around a fifth of heads of Special Schools also considered factors like *"Restricted Space for Learning"* (23.3 percent) and *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (20 percent) as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

5.6.1.5 Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 111)

- *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* and *"Poor Management of the Institution"* were cited as the most constraining factors in the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over two-thirds of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries (71.4 percent and 66.7 percent respectively).

- More than one in two heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries also considered factors like *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (61.9 percent), *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (57.1 percent), and *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (52.4 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Factors like *"Restricted Space for Learning"* (9.5 percent) and *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (9.5 percent), however, were seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

- *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* was seen as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by more than two-fifths (42.9 percent) of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

N=60

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	41.7%
Inexperienced Staff	50.0%
Inadequate levels of staffing	65.0%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	46.7%
Poor monitoring of provision	20.0%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	43.3%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	55.0%
Restricted space for learning	23.3%
Inappropriate accommodation	41.7%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	10.0%
Insufficient budget for resources	53.3%
Poor management of the institution	40.0%

Figure 110 · Factors Considered by Heads of Special Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

- Over a third (38.1 percent) of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries also considered factors like *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* and *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Just under one in five (19 percent) of heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries also considered factors like *"Inexperienced Staff"* and *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

5.6.1.6 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 112)

- *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* were cited as the single most constraining factor in the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by nearly two-thirds (65.6 percent) of heads of Independent Preparatory Schools.

- More than one in two heads of Independent Preparatory Schools also considered factors like *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (57.4 percent), *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (55.7 percent), *"Inexperienced Staff"* (54.1 percent), and *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (52.5 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=21

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	52.4%
Inexperienced Staff	19.0%
Inadequate levels of staffing	38.1%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	61.9%
Poor monitoring of provision	38.1%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	42.9%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	57.1%
Restricted space for learning	9.5%
Inappropriate accommodation	9.5%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	19.0%
Insufficient budget for resources	71.4%
Poor management of the institution	66.7%

Figure 111 Factors Considered by Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (11.5 percent), on the other hand, was seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Independent Preparatory Schools.

- *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* and *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* were considered as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over two-fifths of heads of Independent Preparatory Schools (49.2 percent and 42.6 percent respectively).

- Around a third of heads of Independent Preparatory Schools also considered factors like *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* (34.4 percent) and *"Restricted Space for Learning"* (32.8 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Nearly one in five heads of Independent Preparatory Schools also considered factors like *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (19.7 percent) and *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (18 percent) as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=61

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	57.4%
Inexperienced Staff	54.1%
Inadequate levels of staffing	65.6%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	19.7%
Poor monitoring of provision	18.0%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	34.4%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	42.6%
Restricted space for learning	32.8%
Inappropriate accommodation	49.2%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	11.5%
Insufficient budget for resources	52.5%
Poor management of the institution	55.7%

Figure 112 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.1.7 **Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children** (Figure 113)

- *"Poor Management of the Institution"* and *"Inexperienced Staff"* were cited as the most constraining factors in the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over two-thirds of heads of Independent Nursery Schools (70.8 percent 66.7 percent respectively).

- More than one in two heads of Independent Nursery Schools also considered factors like *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* (58.3 percent), *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (54.2 percent), and *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (50 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Factors like *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (12.5 percent) and *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (16.7 percent), however, were seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

- *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* was seen as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over two-fifths of heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- One in three (33.3 percent) heads of Independent Nursery Schools also considered factors like *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* and *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* and *"Restricted Space for Learning"* were also considered to be very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over a quarter of heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

N=24

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	50.0%
Inexperienced Staff	66.7%
Inadequate levels of staffing	58.3%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	16.7%
Poor monitoring of provision	29.2%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	41.7%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	33.3%
Restricted space for learning	29.2%
Inappropriate accommodation	33.3%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	12.5%
Insufficient budget for resources	54.2%
Poor management of the institution	70.8%

Figure 113 Factors Considered by Heads of Independent Nursery Schools to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.1.8 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries of to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 114)

- Seven in ten (70.6 percent) heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries cited *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* as the single most constraining factor in the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- More than half of heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries also considered factors like *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (61.8 percent), *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (58.8 percent), and *"Inexperienced Staff"* (55.9 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (8.8 percent), however, was seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

- Over two-fifths of heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries considered factors like *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (44.1 percent) and *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* (41.2 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around one in three heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries also considered factors like *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (35.3 percent), *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (35.3 percent), and *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (32.4 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- About a quarter of heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries also considered factors like *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (23.5 percent) and *"Restricted Space for Learning"* as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=34

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	44.1%
Inexperienced Staff	55.9%
Inadequate levels of staffing	70.6%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	35.3%
Poor monitoring of provision	23.5%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	41.2%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	32.4%
Restricted space for learning	26.5%
Inappropriate accommodation	35.3%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	8.8%
Insufficient budget for resources	58.8%
Poor management of the institution	61.8%

Figure 114 Factors Considered by Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.1.9 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 115)

- *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* was seen as the single most constraining factor in the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by more than four in five leaders of Playgroups (81.7 percent).

- Over half of leaders of Playgroups also considered factors like *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* (62.4 percent), *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (57 percent), *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (52. percent), and *"Inexperienced Staff"* (51.6 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Factors like *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (12.9 percent), *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* (15.1 percent), *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (17.2 percent), and *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (18.3 percent), on the other hand, were seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by Leaders of Playgroups.

- More than two in five leaders of Playgroups also considered factors like *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (44.1 percent) and *"Restricted Space for Learning"* (43 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Poor Management of the Institution"* was also seen by over a third (36.6 percent) of leaders of Playgroups as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

5.6.2 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

The following sections present the findings on the factors considered by heads of institutions to be most significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children in State-Maintained (this includes: Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries) and Non-Maintained (this includes: Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups) sectors of under-8 provision.

N=93

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	44.1%
Inexperienced Staff	51.6%
Inadequate levels of staffing	62.4%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	17.2%
Poor monitoring of provision	18.3%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	15.1%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	52.7%
Restricted space for learning	43.0%
Inappropriate accommodation	57.0%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	12.9%
Insufficient budget for resources	81.7%
Poor management of the institution	36.6%

Figure 115 Factors Considered by Leaders of Playgroups to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.2.1 **Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children** (Figure 116)

- More than one in two heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions considered factors like *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* (61.8 percent), *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (59.1 percent), *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (56.5 percent), *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (55.5 percent), and *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (51 percent) as the most constraining factors in the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (13.4 percent), however, was seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* and *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* were seen as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by around two-fifths of heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions (40.3 percent and 39.6 percent respectively).

- Around one in three heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (35.1 percent), *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (30.1 percent), and *"Inexperienced Staff"* (29.4 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Restricted Space for Learning"* was also seen by a quarter (20.7 percent) of heads of institutions in State-Maintained under-8 provisions as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=331

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	56.5%
Inexperienced Staff	29.4%
Inadequate levels of staffing	61.8%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	40.3%
Poor monitoring of provision	30.1%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	39.6%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	51.0%
Restricted space for learning	20.7%
Inappropriate accommodation	35.1%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	13.4%
Insufficient budget for resources	59.1%
Poor management of the institution	55.5%

Figure 116 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.2.2 **Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children** (Figure 117)

- More than one in two heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions considered factors like *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"* (64.2 percent), *"Insufficient Budget for Resources"* (61.8 percent), *"Inexperienced Staff"* (57.1 percent), and *"Poor Management of the Institution"* (56.2 percent) as the most constraining factors in the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Doors"* (11.4 percent), however, was seen as not so significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions.

- Over two-fifths of heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* (48.9 percent), *"Inappropriate Accommodation"* (43.7 percent), and *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* (40.2 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Around one in three heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Inappropriate Procedures for Assessing Children"* (33.1 percent) and *"Restricted Space for Learning"* (32.9 percent) as highly significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

- Just over a fifth of heads of institutions in Non-Maintained under-8 provisions also considered factors like *"Lack of Opportunities for Staff Training and INSET"* (22.2 percent) and *"Poor Monitoring of Provision"* (22.3 percent) as very significant in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children.

N=212

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	48.9%
Inexperienced Staff	57.1%
Inadequate levels of staffing	64.2%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	22.2%
Poor monitoring of provision	22.3%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	33.1%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	40.2%
Restricted space for learning	32.9%
Inappropriate accommodation	43.7%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	11.4%
Insufficient budget for resources	61.8%
Poor management of the institution	56.2%

Figure 117 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.6.3 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children (Figure 118)

Finally, the views of heads of all institutions in the state-maintained, independent and voluntary sectors that were surveyed in the London area are reported.

- *"Poor Management of the Institution"*, *"Inadequate Levels of Staffing"*, *"Insufficient budget for resources"* and *"Staff not Trained for Early Years Specialism"* were considered to be the most constraining factors on the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over half of the heads of institutions in London (59 percent, 58.6 percent, 58.5 percent and 54.7 percent respectively).

- *"Inadequate Provision for Parental Involvement"* and *"Inexperienced Staff"* were considered as very significant factors in constraining the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by over two-fifths (47.3 percent and 43.5 percent respectively) of heads of institutions in London.

- *"Limited Opportunities for Learning Out of Door"* was considered as the least constraining factor on the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children by heads of institutions in London (13.1 percent).

N=271

Constraining Factors:

Staff not trained for early years specialism	54.7%
Inexperienced Staff	43.5%
Inadequate levels of staffing	58.6%
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	32.0%
Poor monitoring of provision	30.2%
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	39.4%
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	47.3%
Restricted space for learning	23.3%
Inappropriate accommodation	36.4%
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	13.1%
Insufficient budget for resources	58.5%
Poor management of the institution	59.0%

Figure 118 Factors Considered by Heads of Institutions in London to be Most Significant in Constraining the Development of an Appropriate Curriculum for Young Children

5.7 FACTORS THAT ARE INFLUENTIAL IN THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTITIONERS WORKING WITH CHILDREN UNDER-8 (Figure 119)

Heads were invited, finally, to place in order of importance factors that are influential in the professional development of practitioners who work with young children. Their responses are reported in the following main section. First, the overall response is summarised and is illustrated in Figure 119.

- The majority of heads of every type of group setting, whether located in the voluntary or independent or state-maintained sector ranked *"Knowledge of Child Development"* as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners who work with the under-8s.

- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"* was considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners, even by the heads of schools for statutory age children, e.g. state-maintained Primary and Infant Schools, and preparatory schools in the private sector.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Children"*, *"Organisational Skills"* and *"Partnership with Parents"* were ranked as highly significant in the professional development of practitioners by heads.

- In-service training of all kinds, by contrast, was ranked low and considered to be less significant in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions.

5.7.1 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Institutions in Different Forms of Under-8 Provision

The following sections present the findings on the factors considered to be influential in the professional development of practitioners working with children under-8 by heads of individual types of institutions. These include Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools, Local Authority Day Nurseries, Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups.

5.7.1.1 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Nursery Schools (Figure 120)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Nursery Schools.

N=534

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.82
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.34
Organisational Skills	3.42
Partnership with Parents	4.24
Openness to Change	4.60
Meticulous Planning	5.46
Regular Staff Meetings	5.78
Understanding of Educational Issues	5.89
Knowledge of School Subjects	6.73
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	7.14
School Based In-service Training	7.15
Local Authority Based In-service Training	8.12
Familiarity with Recent Research	8.63
Higher Education Based In-service Training	9.61
Access to Professional Journals	9.81

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 119 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Nursery Schools.

- *"Partnership with Parents"*, *"Organisational Skills"* and *"Openness to Change"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Nursery Schools.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Nursery Schools.

- *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"* and *"Knowledge of School Subjects"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Nursery Schools.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Nursery Schools.

N=89

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.38
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.54
Partnership with Parents	4.27
Organisational Skills	4.47
Openness to Change	4.66
Understanding of Educational Issues	5.25
Regular Staff Meetings	5.37
Meticulous Planning	5.54
School Based In-service Training	6.28
Local Authority Based In-service Training	7.29
Familiarity with Recent Research	7.91
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	8.43
Knowledge of School Subjects	8.78
Higher Education Based In-service Training	9.32
Access to Professional Journals	9.73

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 120 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Nursery Schools

5.7.1.2 **Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Infant/First Schools** (Figure 121)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- *"Organisational Skills"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"*, *"Partnership with Parents"*, *"Openness to Change"*, *"Meticulous Planning"* and *"Understanding of Educational Issues"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"* and *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Infant/First Schools.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Infant/First Schools.

N=69

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.61
Organisational Skills	3.12
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.63
Partnership with Parents	3.74
Openness to Change	4.65
Meticulous Planning	4.74
Understanding of Educational Issues	4.92
Regular Staff Meetings	5.59
Knowledge of School Subjects	5.74
School Based In-service Training	6.18
Local Authority Based In-service Training	7.54
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	7.64
Familiarity with Recent Research	8.44
Higher Education Based In-service Training	9.22
Access to Professional Journals	9.60

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 121 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Infant/First Schools

5.7.1.3 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Primary Schools (Figure 122)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Primary Schools.

- *"Organisational Skills"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Primary Schools.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"*, *"Meticulous Planning"* and *"Partnership with Parents"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Primary Schools.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Primary Schools.

- *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"* and *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Primary Schools.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Primary Schools.

N=87

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	2.29
Organisational Skills	2.78
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.95
Meticulous Planning	4.06
Partnership with Parents	4.32
Openness to Change	5.60
Understanding of Educational Issues	6.16
Knowledge of School Subjects	6.37
School Based In-service Training	6.80
Regular Staff Meetings	7.81
Local Authority Based In-service Training	8.48
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	9.54
Higher Education Based In-service Training	10.61
Familiarity with Recent Research	10.94
Access to Professional Journals	11.67

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 122 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Primary Schools

5.7.1.4 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Special Schools (Figure 123)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Special Schools.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Special Schools.

- *"Organisational Skills"*, *"Partnership with Parents"* and *"Openness to Change"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Special Schools.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Special Schools.

- *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"* and *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Special Schools.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Special Schools.

N=60

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	2.14
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.19
Organisational Skills	3.28
Partnership with Parents	3.93
Openness to Change	4.90
Meticulous Planning	5.00
Understanding of Educational Issues	5.84
School Based In-service Training	6.17
Regular Staff Meetings	6.25
Knowledge of School Subjects	7.20
Local Authority Based In-service Training	7.52
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	8.42
Familiarity with Recent Research	9.40
Higher Education Based In-service Training	9.73
Access to Professional Journals	10.54

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 123 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Special Schools

5.7.1.5 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries (Figure 124)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

- *"Openness to Change"*, *"Partnership with Parents"*, *"Organisational Skills"* and *"Regular Staff Meetings"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"* and *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries.

5.7.1.6 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools (Figure 125)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Preparatory Schools.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Preparatory Schools.

- *"Organisational Skills"*, *"Meticulous Planning"* and *"Partnership with Parents"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Preparatory Schools.

- *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"*, *"Regular Staff Meetings"*, *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* and *"Access to Professional Journals"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Preparatory Schools.

N=21

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.40
Ability to Assess Individual Child	2.63
Openness to Change	3.29
Partnership with Parents	3.95
Organisational Skills	4.78
Regular Staff Meetings	4.91
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	6.00
Understanding of Educational Issues	6.24
Local Authority Based In-service Training	7.18
Meticulous Planning	7.38
School Based In-service Training	7.80
Knowledge of School Subjects	8.57
Familiarity with Recent Research	8.64
Higher Education Based In-service Training	8.86
Access to Professional Journals	9.57

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 124 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Local Authority Day Nurseries

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Preparatory Schools, with *"Higher Education Based In-service Training"* ranked as the least influential factor.

5.7.1.7 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Independent Nursery Schools (Figure 126)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

- *"Organisational Skills"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

N=60

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	2.02
Ability to Assess Individual Child	2.75
Organisational Skills	2.84
Meticulous Planning	4.64
Partnership with Parents	5.02
Openness to Change	5.43
Knowledge of School Subjects	6.17
Understanding of Educational Issues	6.46
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	7.41
Regular Staff Meetings	7.44
School Based In-service Training	8.77
Familiarity with Recent Research	9.49
Access to Professional Journals	10.84
Local Authority Based In-service Training	11.10
Higher Education Based In-service Training	11.90

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 125 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Independent Preparatory Schools

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"*, *"Meticulous Planning"*, *"Openness to Change"*, *"Partnership with Parents"* and *"Knowledge of School Subjects"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

- *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* and *"Access to Professional Journals"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Nursery Schools.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Independent Nursery Schools, with *"Higher Education Based In-service Training"* ranked as the least influential factor.

N=24

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.88
Organisational Skills	2.30
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.19
Meticulous Planning	4.00
Openness to Change	4.00
Partnership with Parents	4.57
Knowledge of School Subjects	4.76
Regular Staff Meetings	5.21
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	5.53
Understanding of Educational Issues	5.94
School Based In-service Training	6.31
Familiarity with Recent Research	6.88
Access to Professional Journals	7.73
Local Authority Based In-service Training	7.93
Higher Education Based In-service Training	8.64

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 126 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Independent Nursery Schools

5.7.1.8 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries (Figure 127)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

- *"Organisational Skills"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"*, *"Openness to Change"*, *"Regular Staff Meetings"* and *"Partnership with Parents"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"*, *"Meticulous Planning"* and *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries.

N=34

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.70
Organisational Skills	3.17
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.79
Openness to Change	4.44
Regular Staff Meetings	4.52
Partnership with Parents	4.62
Understanding of Educational Issues	5.11
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	5.39
Knowledge of School Subjects	6.27
Meticulous Planning	6.44
School Based In-service Training	7.12
Local Authority Based In-service Training	7.59
Familiarity with Recent Research	7.60
Higher Education Based In-service Training	8.23
Access to Professional Journals	8.64

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 127 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Private and Workplace Nurseries

5.7.1.9 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Leaders of Playgroups (Figure 128)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by leaders of Playgroups.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by leaders of Playgroups.

- *"Partnership with Parents"*, *"Organisational Skills"*, *"Openness to Change"* and *"Regular Staff Meetings"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by leaders of Playgroups.

- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"*, *"Understanding of Educational Issues"*, *"Meticulous Planning"*, *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* and *"Access to Professional Journals"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by leaders of Playgroups.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by Leaders of Playgroups, with *"Higher Education Based In-service Training"* ranked as the least influential factor.

N=90

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.95
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.37
Partnership with Parents	3.74
Organisational Skills	4.01
Openness to Change	4.41
Regular Staff Meetings	4.94
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	5.85
Knowledge of School Subjects	6.73
Understanding of Educational Issues	7.11
Meticulous Planning	7.35
Familiarity with Recent Research	8.35
Local Authority Based In-service Training	8.48
School Based In-service Training	8.89
Access to Professional Journals	9.83
Higher Education Based In-service Training	10.00

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 128 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Leaders of Playgroups

5.7.2 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained and Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

The following sections present the findings on the factors considered to be influential in the professional development of practitioners working with children under-8 by heads of institutions in State-Maintained (this includes: Nursery Schools, Infant/First Schools, Primary Schools, Special Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries) and Non-Maintained (this includes: Independent Preparatory Schools, Independent Nursery Schools, Private/Workplace Nurseries and Playgroups) sectors of under-8 provision.

5.7.2.1 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions (Figure 129)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Organisational Skills"*, *"Partnership with Parents"* and *"Openness to Change"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"*, *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"* and *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in state-maintained under-8 provisions.

N=326

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.76
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.39
Organisational Skills	3.69
Partnership with Parents	4.04
Openness to Change	4.62
Meticulous Planning	5.34
Understanding of Educational Issues	5.68
Regular Staff Meetings	5.99
School Based In-service Training	6.64
Knowledge of School Subjects	7.33
Local Authority Based In-service Training	7.60
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	8.01
Familiarity with Recent Research	9.07
Higher Education Based In-service Training	9.55
Access to Professional Journals	10.24

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 129 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in State-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

5.7.2.2 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions (Figure 130)

- *"Knowledge of Child Development"* was ranked and considered as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Organisational Skills"* was ranked second and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Child"*, *"Partnership with Parents"* and *"Openness to Change"* were also ranked and considered as highly influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions.

- *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"*, *"Understanding of Educational Issues"*, *"Familiarity with Recent Research"* and *"Access to Professional Journals"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions.

- In-service training of all kinds was ranked low and considered to be less influential in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in non-maintained under-8 provisions, with *"Higher Education Based In-service Training"* ranked as the least influential factor.

N=208

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.89
Organisational Skills	3.08
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.27
Partnership with Parents	4.49
Openness to Change	4.57
Regular Staff Meetings	5.53
Meticulous Planning	5.61
Knowledge of School Subjects	5.98
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	6.05
Understanding of Educational Issues	6.16
School Based In-service Training	7.77
Familiarity with Recent Research	8.08
Local Authority Based In-service Training	8.77
Access to Professional Journals	9.26
Higher Education Based In-service Training	9.70

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 130 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in Non-Maintained Under-8 Provisions

5.7.3 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by Heads of Institutions in London (Figure 131)

Finally, the views of heads of all institutions in the state-maintained, independent and voluntary sectors that were surveyed in the London area are reported.

- The majority of heads of every type of group setting in London, whether located in the voluntary or independent or state-maintained sector ranked *"Knowledge of Child Development"* as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners who work with the under-8s.

- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"* and *"Feedback from Staff Appraisal"* were considered to be relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners by the heads of institutions in London.

- *"Ability to Assess Individual Children"*, *"Organisational Skills"* and *"Partnership with Parents"* were ranked as highly significant in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in London.

- In-service training of all kinds, by contrast, was ranked low and considered to be less significant in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in London.

- *"Access to Professional Journals"* was ranked as the least significant in the professional development of practitioners by heads of institutions in London.

N=268

Influential Factors	Ranking Point
Knowledge of Child Development	1.78
Ability to Assess Individual Child	3.27
Organisational Skills	3.50
Partnership with Parents	4.06
Openness to Change	4.36
Regular Staff Meetings	5.50
Meticulous Planning	5.58
Understanding of Educational Issues	5.94
Knowledge of School Subjects	6.54
Feedback from Staff Appraisal	6.74
School Based In-service Training	7.21
Local Authority Based In-service Training	8.08
Familiarity with Recent Research	8.76
Higher Education Based In-service Training	9.34
Access to Professional Journals	9.91

(Note: Ranking Point 1 = the most influential factor)

Figure 131 Factors Considered to be Influential in the Professional Development of Practitioners Working with Children Under-8 by the Heads of Institutions in London

5.8 INFORMATION RELATED TO UNDER EIGHT INSTITUTIONS

The following sections present some general findings on the information relating to institutions for children under-8. These include financial status of the institutions, their sharing of accommodation, their children's access to outdoor playspace, their surrounding environment, the proportion of full-time and part-time children in the institutions, the proportion of boys and girls in the institutions, the proportion of children with English as a second language and the staff to child ratio.

5.8.1 Financial Status of Under-8 Institutions (Figure 132)

- Over half (52.5 Percent) of all under-8 institutions are funded by Local Authorities. These include all the Nursery Schools and Local Authority Day Nurseries, nearly all Infant Schools (93.2 percent) and Special Schools (96.7 percent), the vast majority of Primary Schools (80.7 percent), and a very small proportion of Playgroups (2.1 percent).

- Just over a third (34.4 percent) of under-8 institutions are independently financed. These include all the Independent Preparatory Schools and Independent Nursery Schools, just over three-fifths (61.8 percent) of Private and Workplace Nurseries, over two-fifths (46.3 percent) of Playgroups, and a very small proportion of Special Schools (1.67 percent).

- The rest of under-8 institutions are financed either voluntarily (6.3 percent), or through their grant-maintained status (0.7 percent), or by employers (3.6 percent) or from other sources (2.5 percent).

5.8.2 Sharing of Accommodation in Under-8 Institutions (Figure 133)

- Just over a fifth (21.9 percent) of all under-8 institutions shared their accommodation.

- Nearly three out of four (74.5 percent) Playgroups shared their accommodation with primary schools, church groups/clubs, mother and toddler groups, and/or Sunday schools.

- More than one in five (23.3 percent) Infant/First Schools shared their accommodation with junior/middle schools, playgroups, and/or community groups.

- Less than one in five (18.6 percent) Special Schools shared accommodation with hospitals, secondary schools, health authority units, and/or community education units.

- Just under one in five (19 percent) Local Authority Day Nurseries shared accommodation with playgroups, drop-in's for under-5s, and/or social services.

- Approximately one in five (20.8 percent) Independent Nursery Schools shared accommodation with church groups/clubs.

	Independent	Local Authority	Voluntary	Grant Maintained	Funded by Employer	Others
Nursery Schools (N=90)	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-
Infant Schools (N=73)	-	93.2%	6.9%	-	-	-
Primary Schools (N=88)	-	80.7%	19.3%	-	-	-
Special Schools (N=60)	1.7%	96.7%	-	-	-	1.7%
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=21)	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-
Independent Prep Schools (N=61)	100.0%	-	-	-	-	-
Independent Nursery Schools (N=24)	100.0%	-	-	-	-	-
Private/Workplace Nurseries (N=34)	61.8%	-	5.9%	-	29.4%	2.9%
Playgroups (N=95)	46.3%	2.1%	24.2%	6.3%	3.2%	17.9%
All Provisions (N=546)	**34.4%**	**52.5%**	**6.3%**	**0.7%**	**3.6%**	**2.5%**
State-Maintained (N=332)	0.3%	94.1%	5.2%	-	-	0.3%
Non-Maintained (N=214)	77.0%	0.5%	7.5%	1.6%	8.1%	5.2%
London (N=273) (All Provisions)	33.2%	51.4%	8.3%	0.9%	3.7%	2.5%
London (N=152) (State-Maintained)	-	92.5%	7.5%	-	-	-
London (N=121) (Non-Maintained)	74.7%	-	9.2%	2.1%	8.3%	5.7%
Counties (N=273) (All Provisions)	36.4%	53.6%	3.8%	0.3%	3.7%	2.2%
Counties (N=180) (State-Maintained)	0.6%	95.4%	3.5%	-	-	0.5%
Counties (N=93) (Non-Maintained)	81.2%	1.4%	4.2%	0.7%	8.3%	4.2%

Figure 132 Financial Status of Under-8 Institutions

- Just over a tenth (11.4 percent) of Primary Schools shared their accommodation with playgroups, and/or adult education departments.

- Less than one in ten (9.8 percent) Independent Preparatory Schools shared accommodation with nursery, junior and senior schools, and/or clubs.

- Less than one in seven (13.9 percent) Private and Workplace Nurseries shared accommodation with church groups/clubs, and/or Sunday schools.

- Only a small proportion (5.6 percent) of Nursery Schools shared accommodation with infant schools, social services, and/or parent support groups.

These findings show that the proportion of under-8 institutions in the non-maintained sector who share their accommodation is almost double that in the state-maintained sector (29.8 percent vs 15.6 percent). They also reveal that only one in five (20.1 percent) under-8 institutions in the Counties shares accommodation compared with one in four (25.1 percent) in London.

	Proportion Sharing Accommodation
Nursery Schools (N=90)	5.6%
Infant/First Schools (N=73)	23.3%
Primary Schools (N=88)	11.4%
Special Schools (N=59)	18.6%
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=21)	19.0%
Independent Prep Schools (N=61) (mixed school only)	9.8%
Independent Nursery Schools (N=24)	20.8%
Private/Workplace Nurseries (N=36)	13.9%
Playgroups (N=94)	74.5%
All Provisions (N=546)	**21.9%**
State-Maintained Provisions (N=331)	15.6%
Non-Maintained Provisions (N=215)	29.8%
London (all provisions) (N=271)	25.1%
London (State-Maintained) (N=151)	16.5%
London (Non-Maintained) (N=120)	35.8%
Counties (all provisions) (N=275)	20.1%
Counties (State-Maintained) (N=180)	16.2%
Counties (Non-Maintained) (N=95)	25.0%

Figure 133 Sharing of Accommodation in Under-8 Institutions

5.8.3 Children's Accessibility to Outdoor Playspace in Under-8 Institutions (Figure 134)

- Children have access to outdoor playspace in nearly all types of under-8 provision (97.2 percent).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Children from over two-thirds (70.2 percent) of under-8 institutions have continuous access to outdoor playspace.

	Accessibility to outdoor playspace	Style of Access		
		Continuous	Occasional	Infrequent
Nursery Schools (N=90)	100.0%	91.1%	8.9%	-
Infant/First Schools (N=73)	100.0%	53.4%	23.3%	23.3%
Primary Schools (N=88)	98.8%	65.9%	10.2%	22.7%
Special Schools (N=59)	98.3%	62.7%	15.3%	20.3%
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=21)	100.0%	85.7%	4.8%	9.5%
Independent Prep Schools (N=61)	100.0%	85.3%	4.9%	9.8%
Independent Nursery Schools (N=24)	95.8%	62.5%	12.5%	20.8%
Private/Workplace Nurseries (N=36)	97.2%	83.3%	2.8%	11.1%
Playgroups (N=95)	84.2%	42.1%	30.5%	11.6%
All Provisions (N=547)	**97.2%**	**70.2%**	**12.6%**	**14.4%**
State-Maintained Provisions (N=331)	99.4%	71.8%	12.5%	15.2%
Non-Maintained Provisions (N=216)	94.3%	68.3%	12.7%	13.3%
London (all provisions) (N=272)	97.5%	69.0%	13.3%	15.2%

Figure 134 Children's Accessibility to Outdoor Playspace in Under-8 Institutions

5.8.4 Surrounding Environment of Under-8 Institutions (Figure 135)

- More than one in four (26.3 percent) under-8 institutions who responded to the questionnaire survey are in suburban areas.

- Over two-fifths (22.4 percent) of under-8 institutions who responded to the questionnaire survey are in inner cities.

- A further two-fifths (22.8 percent) of under-8 institutions who responded to the questionnaire survey are in urban areas.

- The rest of under-8 institutions who responded to the questionnaire survey are distributed in traditional rural areas (8 percent), commuter rural areas (9.5 percent), mixed areas (8.4 percent) and other areas (2.6 percent).

- Just over two out of five (41.6 percent) Nursery Schools who responded to the questionnaire survey are in inner cities.

- Nearly two-fifths (39.7 percent) of Special Schools who responded to the questionnaire survey are in suburban areas.

- Three out of five (60 percent) Local Authority Day Nurseries who responded to the questionnaire survey are in inner cities.

- Over two-fifths (42.6 percent) of Independent Preparatory Schools who responded to the questionnaire survey are in suburban areas.

- More than two out of five (45.2 percent) Playgroups who responded to the questionnaire survey are in suburban areas.

- Nearly a third (32.7 percent) of all under-8 institutions in London who responded to the questionnaire survey are in the inner cities.

- Approximately a further third (32 percent) of all under-8 institutions in London who responded to the questionnaire survey are in suburban areas.

5.8.5 Proportion of Full-time and Part-time Children in Under-8 Institutions (Figure 136)

- Over half (58 percent) of children in under-8 institutions are full-time.

- Two-thirds (66.7 percent) of children in state-maintained under-8 provisions are full-time.

- Over half (55.3 percent) of children in non-maintained under-8 provisions are part-time.

- The proportion of full-time and part-time children in all under-8 provisions in London is about the same (full-time: 56.1 percent, part-time:43.9 percent).

	Inner City	Urban Area	Suburban Area	Traditional Rural Area	Commuter Rural Area	Mixed Area	Others
Nursery Schools (N=89)	41.6%	29.2%	18.0%	2.2%	-	9.0%	-
Infant Schools (N=73)	13.7%	28.8%	23.3%	8.2%	8.2%	12.3%	5.5%
Primary Schools (N=88)	15.9%	17.1%	23.9%	20.4%	10.2%	12.5%	-
Special Schools (N=58)	13.8%	20.7%	39.7%	3.4%	5.2%	12.0%	5.2%
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=20)	60.0%	30.0%	5.0%	-	-	5.0%	-
Independent Prep Schools (N=61)	13.1%	13.1%	42.6%	14.8%	9.8%	4.9%	1.7%
Independent Nursery Schools (N=24)	4.2%	25.0%	16.7%	8.3%	33.3%	4.2%	8.3%
Private/ Workplace Nurseries (N=35)	28.6%	31.4%	22.9%	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%	-
Playgroups (N=93)	10.7%	9.7%	45.2%	8.6%	12.9%	9.7%	3.2%
All Provisions (N=541)	**22.4%**	**22.8%**	**26.3%**	**8.0%**	**9.5%**	**8.4%**	**2.6%**
State-Maintained Provisions (N=328)	29.0%	25.1%	22.0%	6.9%	4.7%	10.2%	2.1%
Non-Maintained Provisions (N=213)	14.2%	19.8%	31.8%	9.3%	15.5%	6.1%	3.3%
London (All Provisions) (N=271)	32.7%	26.1%	32.0%	0.3%	4.3%	3.5%	1.1%
London (State-Maintained Provisions) (N=151)	42.6%	27.2%	22.5%	0.5%	2.7%	4.5%	-
London (Non-Maintained Provisions) (N=120)	20.4%	24.7%	43.9%	-	6.2%	2.3%	2.5%

Figure 135 Surrounding Environment of Under-8 Institutions

	Full-time	Part-time
Nursery Schools (N=87)	20.9%	79.1%
Infant/First Schools (N=71)	83.4%	16.6%
Primary Schools (N=83)	92.3%	7.7%
Special Schools (N=52)	83.4%	16.6%
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=21)	57.8%	42.2%
Independent Prep Schools (N=58)	84.9%	15.1%
Independent Nursery Schools (N=24)	46.3%	53.7%
Private/Workplace Nurseries (N=34)	45.1%	54.9%
Playgroups (N=91)	18.5%	81.5%
All Provisions (N=521)	**58.0%**	**42.0%**
State-Maintained Provisions (N=314)	66.7%	33.3%
Non-Maintained Provisions (N=207)	44.7%	55.3%
London (all provisions) (N=260)	56.1%	43.9%

Figure 136 Proportion of Full-time and Part-time Children in Under-8 Institutions

5.8.6 Proportion of Boys and Girls in Under-8 Institutions (Figure 137)

- The proportion of boys and girls in all under-8 provisions is approximately equal (boys: 51.7 percent, girls:48.3 percent).

- Just over half of children in state-maintained under-8 provisions are boys (53.2 Percent).

- Nearly two-thirds (63 percent) of children in Special Schools are boys.

5.8.7 Children with English as a Second Language (ESL) in Under-8 Institutions (Figure 138)

- Over a tenth (11.3 percent) of children in under-8 institutions do not have English as their mother tongue.

- The proportion of children with ESL in state-maintained under-8 provisions is almost double that of the proportion in non-maintained provisions (13.7 percent vs 7.3 percent).

- Nearly a fifth (17.5 percent) of children in Nursery Schools do not have English as their first language. This is over three times that of children with ESL in Independent Nursery Schools (5.3 percent).

- About a sixth (16.9 percent) of children in all under-8 provisions in London do not have English as their first language.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Boys	Girls
Nursery Schools (N=84)	51.2%	48.8%
Infant/First Schools (N=66)	50.2%	49.8%
Primary Schools (N=78)	51.1%	48.9%
Special Schools (N=51)	63.0%	37.0%
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=21)	54.9%	45.1%
Independent Prep Schools (N=38) (mixed school only)	48.2%	51.8%
Independent Nursery Schools (N=23)	52.1%	47.9%
Private/Workplace Nurseries (N=34)	51.0%	49.0%
Playgroups (N=90)	48.4%	51.6%
All Provisions (N=485)	**51.7%**	**48.3%**
State-Maintained Provisions (N=300)	53.2%	46.8%
Non-Maintained Provisions (N=185)	49.3%	50.7%
London (all provisions) (N=241)	51.9%	48.1%
Counties (all provisions) (N=244)	51.5%	48.5%

Figure 137 Proportion of Boys and Girls in Under-8 Institutions

	Proportion of Children with ESL
Nursery Schools (N=80)	17.5%
Infant/First Schools (N=58)	13.2%
Primary Schools (N=69)	9.8%
Special Schools (N=39)	12.7%
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=18)	15.0%
Independent Prep Schools (N=45) (mixed school only)	9.2%
Independent Nursery Schools (N=18)	5.3%
Private/Workplace Nurseries (N=29)	7.7%
Playgroups (N=67)	6.4%
All Provisions (N=423)	**11.3%**
State-Maintained Provisions (N=264)	13.7%
Non-Maintained Provisions (N=159)	7.3%
London (all provisions) (N=217)	16.9%

Figure 138 Proportion of Children with ESL in Under-8 Institutions

5.8.8 Staff (full-time and part-time) to Child Ratio in Under-8 Institutions (Figure 139)

- The average number of children per member of staff in all types of under-8 provisions is nine (staff to child = 1:9).

- Non-maintained under-8 provisions has a slightly higher staff to child ratio than state-maintained provisions (1:7 vs 1:11).

- Special Schools have the highest average number of children per staff member (staff to child = 1:2). Whereas Primary Schools has the lowest average number of children per staff member (staff to child = 1:15).

- The average staff to child ratio for all under-8 institutions in London is 1:9.

	Staff to Child Ratio
Nursery Schools (N=87)	1 : 13
Infant/First Schools (N=68)	1 : 12
Primary Schools (N=80)	1 : 15
Special Schools (N=52)	1 : 2
Local Authority Day Nurseries (N=19)	1 : 4
Independent Prep Schools (N=54) (mixed school only)	1 : 9
Independent Nursery Schools (N=24)	1 : 8
Private/Workplace Nurseries (N=33)	1 : 5
Playgroups (N=87)	1 : 7
All Provisions (N=504)	**1 : 9**
State-Maintained Provisions (N=306)	1 : 11
Non-Maintained Provisions (N=198)	1 : 7
London (all provisions) (N=253)	1 : 9

Note: Number of staff includes both full-time and part-time.

Figure 139 Staff to Child Ratio in Under-8 Institutions

6 DISSEMINATION

The dissemination of the findings of the research will be a major concern in the second and third phases of the project, when the generation of strategies to support the professional development of practitioners will be a major task.

The process of dissemination of research findings, however, is already underway. From the start of the project, the aim has been to disseminate these findings, both qualitative and quantitative, in as effective a manner as possible, and to a wide variety of audiences, including policy-makers and trainers as well as the practitioners themselves. During the first phase, this process has comprised a variety of strategies which have been designed in order to reach these different audiences.

6.1 DISSEMINATION THROUGH NETWORKS

During the first phase, dissemination of findings has taken place through established agencies. There has also been a need, however, to create new networks designed to reach particular audiences more effectively.

6.1.1 Dissemination Through Established Agencies

Dissemination networks have been established through the following agencies:

- Goldsmiths' Association for Early Childhood Education (including the GAEC international network) - networking activities include seminars, conferences and newsletters;

- the Primary Umbrella Group (which represents all organisations concerned with Primary and Nursery Education including those representing governors of schools and parents) - activities include the distribution of information leaflets and seminars;

- Headteacher networks in the counties of Berkshire, Kent and Norfolk and in the London Borough of Sutton - activities include conferences and seminars;

- the London branch of Soroptimist International;

- the local authorities who are participating in the second and third phases of the research - activities include access to the internal mailing networks for distribution of leaflets, conferences, seminars and in-service training sessions.

6.1.2 Dissemination Through New Networks

Dissemination networks are being created as follows:

- a list of individuals who have contacted the research office for information about the project;

- a network, through regular meetings, of action researchers who have been involved in the pilot studies or who are participating in phase two of the project.

6.2 PUBLICATION & REPORTING

The project has already yielded a number of publications, and others are in preparation. These are designed to communicate findings to different groups and at different levels of detail. Information is also made available to the press.

6.2.1 Current Publications

- An interim report on the first phase of the project, Blenkin, G.M. and Yue, N.Y.L. (1994) *"Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning (Year One: June 1993 - May 1994) Interim Report: March 1994"* is available through online retrieval and CD-ROM on the ERIC database and also, in printed form, in the ERIC monthly abstract journals *Resources in Education (RIE)*, and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*

- This final report on the first phase of the project, Blenkin, G.M., Hurst, V.M., Whitehead, M.R. and Yue, N.Y.L. (1995) *"Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning, Phase One Report"* is available, for reference only, in the library of Goldsmiths' College, University of London

- An interim report on the second phase of the project, Blenkin, G.M., Whitehead, M.R., Hurst, V.M., Rose, J.A., Burgess-Macey, C. and Yue, N.Y.L. (1995) *"Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning, Year Two: June 1994-May 1995) Interim Report: February 1995"* is available, for reference only, in the library of Goldsmiths' College, University of London

- A leaflet entitled *"Project Overview"* which contains general information about the project

- A leaflet entitled *"Initial Findings from a Major Survey of Practitioners' Views Conducted During Year One of the Project (June 1993 to May 1994)"* which contains major findings from the questionnaire survey

- A leaflet entitled *"Guidance for Practitioners - Leaflet A: Conducting Action Research"* which contains introductory guidelines on action research and the processes it involves

- A collection of papers on the first phase of the project published in *Early Years*, Volume 15, Number 1, Autumn 1994. Articles include:

    - *A High-Quality Curriculum for Early Years - Some Conceptual Issues*
      A.V. Kelly

    - *Profiling Early Years Practitioners: Some First Impressions from a National Survey*
      Geva M. Blenkin and Nora Y.L. Yue

    - *Stories from a Research Project: Towards a Narrative Analysis of Data*
      Marian Whitehead

- *Telling Verona's Story - A Search for Principles in Practice*
  Geva M. Blenkin and Fran Paffard

- *Examining the Emperor's New Clothes: Nursery Practitioners and the Nursery Curriculum in the Post-1988 Climate*
  Vicky Hurst

- *Promoting a Quality Curriculum in the Early Years Through Action Research: A Case Study*
  Gwyn Edwards and Janet Rose

- *A Question of Balance: Principles and Practicalities in Physical Education*
  Pauline Boorman

6.2.2 Forthcoming Publications

- A book to be published shortly by Paul Chapman Publishing on the findings from the first year of the research

- A series of leaflets containing information and guidelines on professional development for practitioners and policy makers

- Further journal articles on research findings

6.2.3 Press Coverage

- *Alarm sounded on under-fives training* Times Educational Supplement 16.12.94

- A press release giving information about the preliminary findings of the survey conducted in phase one of the research (Appendix G)

7 CONCLUSIONS

In this report of the main findings of the first phase of the research, several issues and patterns of importance have emerged from both the quantitative and qualitative data.

Firstly, the results reveal a remarkable consensus of view among heads of different kinds of group setting. That consensus focuses on the need to provide the child at this stage with a curriculum which will support his/her development, and it is this which influences what is valued as relevant professional knowledge by these heads. A *"Knowledge of Child Development"*, for example, is ranked as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners who work with under-8s by all types of heads, including headteachers in preparatory schools in the private sector, playleaders in playgroups in the voluntary sector and officers-in-charge in day nurseries in the state-maintained sector.

Secondly, the results show that practitioners share a negative attitude - or at least an indifference - towards training and professional development. And this view is also expressed by heads from the full range of institutions. This could reveal either an anti-intellectualism towards higher-level forms of professional education or a diffidence about their own ability to engage in such education. Further analysis of the data may offer a resolution of this question.

Thirdly, perhaps the most important insight of all which has emerged from the findings is the claim that the key to achieving quality in early learning lies with the practitioners themselves. Most, for example, cited *"The Qualities of Staff"* as a critical factor in ensuring quality of provision in the early years.

The project, therefore, is building on this evidence which suggests that the role of the practitioner is central and crucial to effective education. This is being done by focusing on the professional development of practitioners who are working with young children. The project has entered its second phase and the intention is to develop strategies which will enable early years practitioners to evaluate their effectiveness in providing quality care and education. This is being done by encouraging practitioners to identify and question those principles which inform their practice, with the overall aim of raising the quality of that practice.

It is becoming increasingly clear that policies for early education are crucial to the future of the nation, both economically and socially. There is thus much attention currently being devoted to those policies. If, as a nation, we are to get them right, we need as full an understanding as can be achieved of what constitutes the right kind of educational provision for young children and of preparation for the adults who work with them.

This research is seeking to make its own contribution to the combined tasks of establishing what is a quality curriculum for the early years and assisting practitioners to provide it for all children as effectively as possible.

Appendix A

Pilot Questionnaire

[For official use only:

Date received: ....   Ref no:............................]

GOLDSMITHS' COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Early Childhood Education Research Project

PRINCIPLES INTO PRACTICE: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning

---

General Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to gather information and opinions for the Early Childhood Education Research Project. By completing this questionnaire, you and your colleagues are helping to increase our understanding of how we can improve the quality of children's learning in these important early stages. We appreciate your cooperation. Data gathered in this questionnaire will be treated confidentially and presented only in a summary form without the name or affiliation of the respondent.

Name of respondent: ....

Status: ....

Name and address of educational institution or group:

....

....

....

....

Telephone number: ....

Age range of children catered for: ....

Part I: Information Related to the Institution

1 **Of what type is your institution/group?** (Please tick as appropriate)

Nursery school [ ]1
Infant school [ ]2
First school [ ]3
Primary or JMI [ ]4
(Junior mixed and infants)
Local authority day nursery [ ]5
Private day nursery [ ]6
Nursery class [ ]7
Workplace nursery [ ]8
Independent preparatory school [ ]9
Independent nursery school [ ]10
Playgroup [ ]11
Special needs school/unit [ ]12

Others, please specify: ....

2 **Financial status of your educational institution or group:** (Please tick as appropriate)

Independent [ ]1
Local Authority [ ]3
Voluntary [ ]2
Funded by Employer [ ]4

Others, please specify:........................

3 **Does your institution share accommodation with other institution(s)/group(s)?**

Yes [ ]1
No [ ]2

If Yes, please specify: ....

4 **Please give a brief description of the surrounding environment?** (Please tick as appropriate)

Inner urban area [ ]1
Suburban area [ ]2
Traditional rural area [ ]3
Commuter rural area [ ]4

Others [ ]5 Please specify: ....

5 **Do the children have access to outdoor play space at your institution/group?**

Yes [ ]1
No [ ]2

If Yes, what is the style of access? (Please tick as appropriate)

Continuous [ ]1
Occasional [ ]2
Infrequent (eg requires an expedition with adults, supervised playtime etc.) [ ]3

6 Number and gender of children and number of ESL children in each age group: (Please state the number of children in each category)

Age:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	For official use only: Total
Full-time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Part-time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Boys	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Girls	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Children whose first language is not English (ESL)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Part II: Number & Qualifications of Staff

7 What is/are your qualification(s)? (Please tick as appropriate)

BA(Ed)/BEd [ ]1
NNEB [ ]2
SRN [ ]3
PGCE [ ]3
NVQS [ ]4
BTech [ ]5
MA [ ]6
MPhil/PhD [ ]7
Cert.Ed.(2 years) [ ]8
Cert.Ed.(3 years) [ ]9
Montessori Certificate [ ]10
PPA Basic Course Certificate: Learning Through Play [ ]11
PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice [ ]12
PPA Fieldwork Diploma [ ]13
None [ ]14
Others, please specify: [ ]15
....

8 Please indicate the number of full-time and part-time staff, both paid and voluntary:

Full-time paid [ ]1
Full-time voluntary [ ]2
Part-time paid [ ]3
Part-time voluntary [ ]4

9 What are the qualifications of the staff who work closely with children? (Please state numbers for each gender in each category)

	Teachers (1)	Support teachers (2)	Nursery nurses (3)	Nursery workers (4)	Classroom assistants (5)	Others (6)
Q1 BA(Ed) or BEd						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q2 NNEB						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q3 SRN						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f

	Teachers (1)	Support teachers (2)	Nursery nurses (3)	Nursery workers (4)	Classroom assistants (5)	Others (6)
Q4 PGCE						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q5 NVQs						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q6 MA						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q7 MPhil/PhD						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q8 BTech						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q9 Cert.Ed. (2 years)						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q10 Cert.Ed. (3 years)						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q11 Montessori Certificate						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q12 PPA Basic Course Certificate: Learning Through Play						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q13 PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q14 PPA Tutor Fieldwork Diploma						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q15 None						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q16 Others, Please specify:						
....						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f

10 If you have Qualified Teachers on your staff, which age range were they trained for initially? (Please state numbers for each gender in each category)

	Age Range							
	3-5 (1)	3-8 (2)	5-7 (3)	3-11 (4)	5-11 (5)	7-11 (6)	11-16 (7)	Others (8)
Qualified Teacher Status:								
R1 BA(Ed)/BEd								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
R2 PGCE								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
R3 Cert.Ed								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
R4 Others, please specify:								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m

11 Have any of your staff re-trained for early years? (Please state numbers for each gender in each category)

	Early Years Age Range		
	3-5 (1)	5-8 (2)	3-8 (3)
S1 BA(Ed)/BEd			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S2 NNEB			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S3 SRN			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S4 PGCE			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S5 NVQs			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S6 MA			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f

	Early Years Age Range		
	3-5 (1)	5-8 (2)	3-8 (3)
S7 MPhil/PhD			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S8 BTech			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S9 Cert.Ed.			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S10 Montessori Certificate			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S11 PPA Basic Course: Learning Through Play			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S12 PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S13 PPA Tutor Fieldwork Course			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f
S14 Others, please specify:			
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f

Part III: Planning for Early Learning

12 The following list identifies some of the factors that are influential in planning a curriculum for young children. Please tick the five that you consider to be the most influential factors.

Qualifications of staff	[ ]1
Range of experience of staff	[ ]2
Length of experience of staff	[ ]3
Qualities of staff	[ ]4
Provision for staff development and INSET	[ ]5
Evaluating provision	[ ]6
Keeping records of children's learning	[ ]7
Assessment of children	[ ]8
Effective partnership with parents	[ ]9
High ratio of staff to children	[ ]10
Provision of an effective environment for learning	[ ]11
An adequate physical environment for learning	[ ]12
A supportive social environment	[ ]13
High quality resources for early learning	[ ]14
Adequate number of resources for early learning	[ ]15
Management structure of the institution/group	[ ]16

Others, please specify:

.... [ ]

.... [ ]

13 The following list identifies some of the factors that constrain curriculum planning for young children. Please tick the five that you consider to be the most constraining factors.

Staff not trained for early years specialism	[ ]1
Inexperienced staff	[ ]2
Inadequate levels of staffing	[ ]3
Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET	[ ]4
Poor monitoring of provision	[ ]5
Inappropriate procedures for assessing children	[ ]6
Inadequate provision for parental involvement	[ ]7
Restricted space for learning	[ ]8
Inappropriate accommodation	[ ]9
Limited opportunities for learning out of doors	[ ]10
Insufficient budget for resources	[ ]11
Poor management of the institution	[ ]12

Others, please specify:

.... [ ]

.... [ ]

14 What factors do you think are influential in your professional development? (Please place a "1" against the most influential factor and a "2" against the next most influential factor and so on. For two or more factors which you think are of equal importance, please place the same number against each factor)

Knowledge of child development [ ]1
Meticulous planning [ ]2
Organisational skills [ ]3
Knowledge of school subjects [ ]4
Ability to assess individual children [ ]5
Feedback from staff appraisal [ ]6
Regular staff meetings [ ]7
Partnership with parents [ ]8
Openness to change [ ]9
Understanding of educational issues [ ]10
Familiarity with recent research [ ]11
Access to professional journals [ ]12
School based in-service training [ ]13
Local Authority based in-service training [ ]14
Higher Education based in-service training [ ]15

Others, please specify:

.... [ ]

.... [ ]

15 How would you describe a quality curriculum for young children?
(Please use additional sheets if necessary)

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire.

Would you be available for further discussions/interviews? Yes [ ]1 No [ ]2

Please return the questionnaire to:

Dr Nora Y L Yue
Early Childhood Education Research Centre
Faculty of Education
Goldsmiths' College
University of London
New Cross
London SE14 6NW

Appendix B

Evaluation Questionnaire used in Pilot Study

[For official use only:

Date received: .... Ref no:.........................]

PILOT EVALUATION FORM

The purpose of the pilot exercise is firstly to determine areas in the questionnaire which may need changes or attention in order to ensure that subjects in our main study will experience no difficulties in completing it. Secondly the exercise will enable us to carry out a preliminary analysis to see whether the wording and format of the questions will present any difficulties when the main data are analyzed. Any comments or information you give will be a valuable source of feedback to enable us to revise the questionnaire ready for the main distribution.

1 How long did it take you to complete the questionnaire?

....

2 Were the instructions on the questionnaire clear and easy to follow?

Yes [ ]1 No [ ]2

3 What do you think of the appearance and general layout of the questionnaire?

Good	Fairly good	About average	Fairly poor	Poor	Very poor
[ ]1	[ ]2	[ ]3	[ ]4	[ ]5	[ ]6

4 Were any of the questions unclear or ambiguous? If so, please state which and why?

Part I - Information Related to the Institution:..

....

Part II - Number and Qualifications of Staff:..

....

....

Part III - Planning for Early Learning:..

....

....

....

....

5 **Did you have difficulties in answering any of the questions? If so, please state which and why?**

Part I - Information Related to the Institution:..

....

....

Part II - Number and Qualifications of Staff:...

....

....

....

Part III - Planning for Early Learning:...

....

....

....

....

6 **Did you object to answering any of the questions? If so, which ones?**

Part I - Information Related to the Institution:..

....

....

Part II - Number and Qualifications of Staff:...

....

....

Part III - Planning for Early Learning:...

....

....

....

....

7 **In your opinion, has any major topic or question been omitted? If so, please state which and why?**

....

....

....

....

....

....

8 **Do you have any further comments on the questionnaire?**

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

Thank you very much for completing this evaluation form.

Please return the questionnaire to:

Dr Nora Y L Yue
Early Childhood Education Research Centre
Faculty of Education
Goldsmiths' College
University of London
New Cross
London SE14 6NW

Appendix C

Summary of Feedback from Evaluation Questionnaire

Summary of Feedback from Evaluation Questionnaires

Respondents

- 1 from Infant School
- 1 from First School
- 3 from Primary Schools
- 1 from Local Authority Day Nursery
- 1 from Independent Nursery School
- 3 from Playgroups

1 How long did it take you to complete the questionnaire?

Playgroup 1 : *15 minutes*
Playgroup 2 : *15 minutes*
Local Authority Day Nursery : *15-20 minutes*
Playgroup 3 : *30 minutes*
Primary School 2 : *40 minutes*
Primary School 1 : *45 minutes*
Independent Nursery School : *1 hour*
Infant School : *1 hour*
First School : *2 hours*
Primary School : quite a while

2 Were the instructions on the questionnaire clear and easy to follow?

Yes [9]1 No [1]2

3 What do you think of the appearance and general layout of the questionnaire?

Good	Fairly good	About average	Fairly poor	Poor	Very poor
[3]1	[5]2	[2]3	[0]4	[0]5	[0]6

4 Were any of the questions unclear or ambiguous? If so, please state which and why?

Part I - Information Related to the Institution:

Primary School 1:
1-5 o.k. no.6 - asking for gender split difficult when registers are not split this way.

Infant School:
"Financial Status" seems a puzzling phrase - perhaps "establishment status".

Primary School 3:
Would like a clear definition of "Early Childhood"

Part II - Number and Qualifications of Staff:

Primary School 1:
no.7 - unsure
no.8 - did you want whole school numbers or just staff teaching under-8s?
no.9 - was this just early years teachers?

Primary School 2:
Yes, 7 & 9 - not clear whether respondent should include him/herself in answer 9.

Primary School 3:
Staff in whole institution or just 3-8 year olds?

Local Authority Day Nursery:
A bit unclear on qualification of staff - was it the person filling it up or staff group in general.

Part III - Planning for Early Learning:

Primary School 1:
no.14 - Did you want one list from each early years teacher or just me? - Attached find a cross section from a few teachers.

5 Did you have difficulties in answering any of the questions? If so, please state which and why?

Part I - Information Related to the Institution:

First School:
Clear and straight forward.

Primary School 1:
Asking for numbers in National Curriculum year groups would have been easier than ages.

Primary School 3:
It would have been much easier to give numbers of children by school year than by age, and comes to almost the same thing.

Playgroup 2:
It would be useful to have a date. We have children 2 sessions and 4 sessions but cannot divide them.

Part II - Number and Qualifications of Staff:

First School:
Did not particularly like this format - appeared complex and felt confused at times. Timing (holidays) made it difficult to have access to accurate information.

Primary School 1:
No.7 - who were you asking - 1 teacher, all teachers?

Infant School:
I needed time to go through original data to collate the information.

Playgroup 2:
Our structure does not fit. We have play leaders and assistants but no overall head. One staff member had 2 qualifications.

Part III - Planning for Early Learning:

First School:
No problems here - engaged interest and found the format a 'relief' after completing previous section!

Infant School:
Sometimes one answer would imply another - it was difficult to exclude some responses!

Primary School 2:
Almost impossible to choose five factors.

Independent Nursery School:
Question 13 did not fit their setting.

Playgroup 2:
Question 14 not applicable - surely it is not the head teacher's professional development which matters but that of staff in contact with children.

6 Did you object to answering any of the questions? If so, which ones?

Primary School 1:
None - only time factor a problem with so many other priorities.

Part I - Information Related to the Institution:

No comments made.

Part II - Number and Qualifications of Staff:

No comments made.

Part III - Planning for Early Learning:

No comments made.

7 In your opinion, has any major topic or question been omitted? If so, please state which and why?

Primary School 2:
More detail on provision both in terms of learning and resources, also groupings of children.

Independent Nursery School:
How long children generally stay in setting, e.g. 2.5 to 5 years or leaving earlier.

Playgroup 2:
(i) It might be useful to ask about the structure of a child's day - some are much more structured than others and this affects the curriculum they receive.
(ii) Does the curriculum offered vary with age?

8 Do you have any further comments on the questionnaire?

First School:
Perhaps you could consider re-designing Part 2 in order to minimise potential errors from respondents. A complicated looking format is off-putting, as in Part 2, whereas Parts 1 and 3 (simplicity of design) invite participation and engage interest.

Infant School:
(1) The timing of this exercise was difficult - term time would have been easier.
(2) I think it would be helpful if the print was a little larger in the lists - difficult to tell which number goes with which item.

Primary School 1:
I'm sorry I don't seem to have done justice to your research work, but beginning of new school year was not a good time to receive this form - staff queried relevance/reason for giving information and I'm afraid it kept being demoted to the bottom of my priority list/pile.

Local Authority Day Nursery:
ESL - the ages for girls and boys - found 'unclear' to fill in.

Playgroup 2:
I am not sure if I was the right person to fill this in, but there wasn't time to pass it on. Playgroups have a more varied structure than schools. We have separate morning and afternoon groups sharing equipment but not staff. The curriculum varies slightly, partly because afternoon children often go elsewhere in the morning. Why divide on grounds on sex.

Appendix D

Justification of the Methodology Used in the Determination of the Sample Size for the Survey

Justification of the Methodology Used in Determining the Required Sample Size for the Survey

It is evident that an increase in sample size will lead to an increase in the precision of the sample mean as an estimator of the population mean. However, the sampling costs will also increase and there is likely to be some limit on what we can afford. Too large a sample will imply a waste of resources; whereas too small a sample is likely to produce an estimator of inadequate precision. Ideally we should state the precision we require, or the maximum cost which we can expend, and choose the sample size accordingly.

Such an aim involves a complex array of considerations:

- what is the cost structure for sampling in a given situation?
- how do we assess the precision we require of our estimators?
- how do we balance needs in relation to *different* population characteristics which may be of interest?
- how do we deal with a lack of knowledge about the parameters (e.g. the population variance) which may affect the precision of estimators?

It is the last consideration that we are most concerned about in our particular study. In this survey, the main population characteristic in which we are interested is:

- the nature and qualifications of practitioners working with children under-8

There has been no previous research which seeks to identify this characteristic in the population of practitioners working with children under-8 in England & Wales. There is no record, therefore, of the population variance which could be used to estimate the required sample size for our survey.

In addition to this, there is a range of different institutional settings in which the practitioners are working with children under-8, and there has been no previous measurement of variability on the nature of the qualifications of practitioners within each of these settings. We needed, therefore, to find alternative ways of estimating the required sample size which would represent both the whole population and a valid sample from each of the types of provision. And we needed to do this without prior knowledge of any measurement of variability within this population.

There are basically four ways in which we might have set about the task of estimating the minimum sample size required when the population variance S^2 is unknown:

1. *From pilot studies*

If the pilot study itself takes the form of a simple random sample, its results may give some indication of the value of S^2 for use in the choice of the sample size of the main survey.

The selection of participants in our pilot study does not take the form of a simple random sample since it was made through contacts. Therefore, if the pilot sample is not obtained by a probability sampling procedure, we must be circumspect in such an application of the results. In addition, the pilot study is often restricted to some limited part of the population, and so the estimate of S^2 which it yields for the population characteristic can be quite biased.

2. *From previous surveys*

It is not uncommon to find that other surveys have been conducted elsewhere which have studied similar characteristics in similar populations. Often the measure of variability from earlier surveys can be used to estimate S^2 for the present population, in order to choose the required sample size to validate any prescription of precision in the current work. However, the characteristics we have chosen to study in this survey have not been explored elsewhere previously. Hence, we have no previous measurements of variability from which we could estimate the sample size required for our survey. Furthermore, taking measurements from previous studies may also introduce error, and precautions must be taken in extrapolating measurements from one situation to another.

3. *From a preliminary sample*

This is the most reliable approach. However, it was not feasible on administration and cost considerations for our project. This approach operates as follows. A preliminary simple random sample of size n_1 is taken and used to estimate S^2 by means of the sample variance s_1^2. We aim to ensure that n_1 is inadequate to achieve the required precision, and then to augment the sample with a further simple random sample of size $(n-n_1)$, where $(n-n_1)$ is chosen by using s_1^2 as the necessary preliminary estimate of S^2. The total sample size needs to be

$$(1+2/n_1)s_1^2/V \qquad \text{(where } V = \text{variance of the sample mean)}$$

an essential increase by the factor $(1+2/n_1)$ over what would be needed if S^2 were known.

This approach, if feasible, is undoubtedly the most objective and reliable. This sampling procedure is known as *double (or two-phase) sampling*.

4. *From practical considerations of the structure of the population*

Occasionally we will have some knowledge of the structure of the population which throws light on the value of S^2. In these cases, there is reason to believe that the Y-values (the measurements of characteristics from each sample of the population) might vary roughly in the manner of a Poisson distribution, so it is plausible to assume that S^2 is of the same order of magnitude as the population mean. Any information we have about the possible value of the population mean (eg from other similar studies) can then be used to estimate S^2 and assist in the choice of the required sample size. Furthermore, if we can assume that S^2 = population mean, then we can obtain an approximate $100(1-\alpha)\%$ symmetric two-sided confidence interval for the population mean directly, without the need for an estimate of variability.

In our survey, we were interested in estimating a proportion of the population having a certain characteristic. In this case, the sampling variance of the simple random sample estimator is simply related to the population proportion. The procedure used in determining our sample size for estimating the true population proportion is explained in detail below:

> The task of determining the size of the sample needed requires prior specification of the desired level of confidence and the acceptable margin of error between the values of $\overline{X}$ (the sample mean) and μ (the population mean). The margin of error, or error of estimate is often called the error tolerance to reflect the imprecision a decision maker is willing to tolerate. The margin of error E is specified as the absolute value of the difference between the point estimate $\hat{p}$ and the true population proportion p; it is written as
>
> $$|\hat{p} - p| = E$$
>
> The expression for determining the sample size requires the value of E, the value of $Z_{\alpha/2}$ (determined from the level of confidence specified), and an initial estimate of p, denoted by p^*:
>
> $$n = (Z_{\alpha/2}/E)^2 p^*(1-p^*)$$
>
> Prior to sampling, available information about p based on past experience or theoretical considerations may be used as a base for the specified value for p^*. If, prior to sampling, there is no reasonable basis for specifying p^* (which is the case in this survey since there has been no previous study), then p^* is set to 0.5. In the latter case, we use $p^* = 0.5$ because it can be shown that the product $p^*(1 - p^*)$ reaches a maximum value of 0.25 when $p^* = 0.5$. When $p^*(1 - p^*)$ is set at 0.25, the above equation maximises the value for n, the needed sample size, thereby assuring that the margin of error will be within the specified range with at least the specified level of confidence, no matter what the actual value of p. If the numerical value for n found from the above equation is not an integer, the result is rounded up to guarantee that the confidence level will be at least $1 - \alpha$. Table A shows the maximum sample size required for estimating p for various confidence levels.

Table A: **Sample Size (no. of institutions) Required for Estimating the True Population Proportion**

	Confidence Level			
	99%	98%	95%	90%
Margin of Error				
2%	4148	3382	2401	1692
5%	664	542	385	271
6%	461	376	267	188
7%	339	276	196	138
8%	260	212	150	106
10%	166	136	97	68

The sample size for the questionnaire survey was determined according to the sample population for each type of under-8 provision and the funding available. The latter was crucial in determining the survey sample size.

It was decided that for each type of under-8 provision, in order to claim, with at least 90% confidence, that the observed value of the sample proportion is within 7% of the true proportion of each type of provision, a random sample of 138 institutions/groups was needed for each type of provision (see Table A - 90% confidence level, 7% margin of error).

Since in all questionnaire surveys it is almost impossible to obtain 100% response, it is necessary to adjust and compensate the sample size required for the survey. It was anticipated that in this survey we would expect a response from at least half of our targeted institutions/groups. Therefore, the sample size chosen for each type of provisions was 2 x 138 = 276. Provisions with sample population less than 276 were surveyed in full.

The methodology used in selecting the survey sample is known as two-stage cluster sampling with unequal cluster sizes (a simple random sample of education authorities, and a simple random sample of under-8 provisions under each of the selected authorities).

Appendix E

Survey Questionnaire

[For ECERP Office only:

Date received: .... Ref no:....................................]

GOLDSMITHS' COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Early Childhood Education Research Project

PRINCIPLES INTO PRACTICE: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning

---

In most countries in the world, the importance of early learning is increasingly being recognised and attempts are being made to improve the quality of provision for children from birth to eight years of age. It is in this context that the Early Childhood Education Project at Goldsmiths' College has been established. This questionnaire is designed both to gather information about current provision for children at this important stage in their education and to glean the opinions of you and your colleagues in relation to potential areas for development. Its main purpose is to create a base of understandings from which improvements might be planned. Your cooperation in completing the questionnaire is thus very important, and by doing so you will be contributing directly to that process of development.

We appreciate your cooperation. We would also point out that data gathered in this questionnaire will be treated confidentially and presented only in summary form without the name or the affiliation of the respondent.

Name of respondent: ....

Status: ....

Name and address of educational institution or group:

....

....

....

....

Telephone number: ....

Age range of children catered for: ....

Part I: Information Related to the Institution

1 Of what type is your institution/group? (Please tick as appropriate)

Nursery school [ ]1
Infant school [ ]2
First school [ ]3
Primary or JMI [ ]4
(Junior mixed and infants)
Local authority day nursery [ ]5
Private day nursery [ ]6
Nursery class [ ]7
Workplace nursery [ ]8
Independent preparatory school [ ]9
Independent nursery school [ ]10
Playgroup [ ]11
Special needs school/unit [ ]12

Others, please specify: ....

2 Status of your institution/group: (Please tick as appropriate)

Independent [ ]1
Local Authority [ ]2
Voluntary [ ]3
Grant Maintained [ ]4
Funded by Employer [ ]5
Others, please specify:....................................

3 Does your institution share accommodation with other institution(s)/group(s)?

Yes [ ]1
No [ ]2

If Yes, please specify: ....

4 Please give a brief description of the surrounding environment? (Please tick as appropriate)

Inner city [ ]1
Urban area [ ]2
Suburban area [ ]3
Traditional rural area [ ]4
Commuter rural area [ ]5
Mixed area [ ]6

Others [ ]7 Please specify: ....

5 Do the children have access to outdoor play space at your institution/group?

Yes [ ]1
No [ ]2

If Yes, what is the style of access? (Please tick as appropriate)

Continuous [ ]1
Occasional [ ]2
Infrequent (eg requires an expedition with adults, supervised playtime etc.) [ ]3

6 Number of full-time and part-time children on roll in each age group: (Please state the number of children in each age group)

Age:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	For ECERP office only: Total
Full-time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Part-time	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

7 Gender of children in each age group: (Please state the number of boys and girls in each age group)

Age:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	For ECERP office only: Total
Boys	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Girls	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

8 Number of children with English as a second language (ESL) in each age group: (Please state the number of ESL children in each age group)

Age:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	For ECERP office only: Total
Children whose first language is not English (ESL)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Part II: Number & Qualifications of Staff

9 What is/are your own qualification(s)? (Please tick as appropriate)

BA(Ed)/BEd/B.Add [ ]1
BA [ ]2
BSc [ ]3
NNEB, City & Guilds or equivalent [ ]4
SRN [ ]5
PGCE [ ]6
NVQS [ ]7

BTech [ ]8
MA/MEd/M.Add [ ]9
Cert.Ed.(2 years) [ ]10
Cert.Ed.(3 years) [ ]11
Montessori Certificate [ ]12
PPA Short Courses e.g. Learning Through Play, First Aid etc. [ ]13

PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice [ ]14
PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course [ ]15
PPA Further Course [ ]16
MPhil/PhD [ ]17
None [ ]18
Others, please specify: [ ]19

....

10 Please indicate the number of full-time and part-time staff, both paid and voluntary, who work closely with children under-8 (including yourself if appropriate).

Full-time paid	[ ]1	Part-time paid	[ ]3
Full-time voluntary	[ ]2	Part-time voluntary	[ ]4

11 What are the qualifications of the staff (other than yourself) who work closely with children under-8? (Please state numbers for each gender in each category)

	Teachers (1)	Support teachers (2)	Nursery nurses (3)	Nursery workers (4)	Classroom assistants (5)	Others (6)
Q1 BA(Ed)/BEd/B.Add						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q2 BA						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q3 BSc						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q4 NNEB, City & Guilds or equivalent						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q5 SRN						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q6 PGCE						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q7 NVQs						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q8 MA/MEd/M.Add						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q9 MPhil/PhD						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q10 BTech						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q11 Cert.Ed. (2 years)						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q12 Cert.Ed. (3 years)						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q13 Montessori Certificate						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f

	Teachers (1)	Support teachers (2)	Nursery nurses (3)	Nursery workers (4)	Classroom assistants (5)	Others (6)
Q14 PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q15 PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q16 PPA Short Courses e.g. Learning Through Play, First Aid etc.						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q17 PPA Further Course						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q18 None						
Male	[ ]1m.	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f
Q19 Others, Please specify:						
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f

12 Where individual members of staff are counted more than once in question 11, please indicate their gender, role and their combination of qualifications.

Examples: female teacher - BA(Ed), MA
male nursery nurse - NNEB, SRN
(Please use additional sheets if necessary)

13 Have any of your staff re-trained for work with children under-8? (Please state numbers for each gender in each category)

	Early Years Age Range			
	0-3 (1)	0-5 (2)	5-8 (3)	3-8 (4)
S1 BA(Ed)/BEd/B.Add				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S2 BA				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S3 BSc				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S4 NNEB, City & Guilds or other equivalent				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S5 SRN				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S6 PGCE				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S7 NVQs				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S8 BTech				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S9 Cert.Ed.				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S10 Montessori Certificate				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S11 PPA Diploma in Playgroup Practice				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S12 PPA Tutor & Fieldwork Course				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S13 PPA Short Courses e.g. Learning Through Play, First Aid etc.				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S14 PPA Further Course				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f
S15 Others, please specify:				
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f

14 If you have Qualified Teachers on your staff, which age range were they trained for initially? (Please state numbers for each gender in each category)

	Age Range							
	3-5 (1)	3-8 (2)	5-7 (3)	3-11 (4)	5-11 (5)	7-11 (6)	11-16 (7)	Others (8)
Qualified Teacher Status:								
R1 BA(Ed)/BEd/B.Add								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f	[ ]7f	[ ]8f
R2 PGCE								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f	[ ]7f	[ ]8f
R3 Cert.Ed								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f	[ ]7f	[ ]8f
R4 Others, please specify:								
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m	[ ]5m	[ ]6m	[ ]7m	[ ]8m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f	[ ]5f	[ ]6f	[ ]7f	[ ]8f

15 Have any of your qualified teachers engaged in further study related to early childhood education? (Please state numbers for each gender in each category)

	In-service BEd (1)	Professional Diploma (2)	MA/MEd/ M.Add (3)	MPhil/PhD (4)
Male	[ ]1m	[ ]2m	[ ]3m	[ ]4m
Female	[ ]1f	[ ]2f	[ ]3f	[ ]4f

Others, please specify:

.... [ ]male [ ]female

.... [ ]male [ ]female

.... [ ]male [ ]female

Part III: The Quality of Early Learning

Please note that in this section we are asking for your general views on the quality of early learning, regardless of your own institution/group.

16 The following list identifies some of the factors that support the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children. Please tick the FIVE that you consider to be the MOST significant factors.

Qualifications of staff [ ]1
Range of experience of staff [ ]2
Length of experience of staff [ ]3
Qualities of staff [ ]4
Provision for staff development and INSET [ ]5
Evaluating provision [ ]6
Keeping records of children's learning [ ]7
Assessment of children [ ]8
Effective partnership with parents [ ]9
High ratio of staff to children [ ]10
Provision of an effective environment for learning [ ]11
An adequate physical environment for learning [ ]12
A supportive social environment [ ]13
High quality resources for early learning [ ]14
Adequate number of resources for early learning [ ]15
Management structure of the institution/group [ ]16

Others, please specify:

.... [ ]
.... [ ]
.... [ ]
.... [ ]
.... [ ]

17 The following list identifies some of the factors that constrain the development of an appropriate curriculum for young children. Please tick the FIVE that you consider to be the MOST constraining factors.

Staff not trained for early years specialism [ ]1

Inexperienced staff [ ]2

Inadequate levels of staffing [ ]3

Lack of opportunities for staff training and INSET [ ]4

Poor monitoring of provision [ ]5

Inappropriate procedures for assessing children [ ]6

Inadequate provision for parental involvement [ ]7

Restricted space for learning [ ]8

Inappropriate accommodation [ ]9

Limited opportunities for learning out of doors [ ]10

Insufficient budget for resources [ ]11

Poor management of the institution [ ]12

Others, please specify:

.... [ ]

.... [ ]

.... [ ]

.... [ ]

.... [ ]

18 **What factors do you think are influential in the professional development of practitioners working with children under-8?** (Please place a "1" against the most influential factor and a "2" against the next most influential factor and so on. For two or more factors which you think are of equal importance, please place the same number against each factor)

Knowledge of child development [ ]1
Meticulous planning [ ]2
Organisational skills [ ]3
Knowledge of school subjects [ ]4
Ability to assess individual children [ ]5
Feedback from staff appraisal [ ]6
Regular staff meetings [ ]7
Partnership with parents [ ]8
Openness to change [ ]9
Understanding of educational issues [ ]10
Familiarity with recent research [ ]11
Access to professional journals [ ]12
School based in-service training [ ]13
Local Authority based in-service training [ ]14
Higher Education based in-service training [ ]15

19 How would you describe a quality curriculum for young children?
(Please use additional sheets if necessary)

20 What improvements would you like to see in the current educational provision for under-8s and in the professional training and development for practitioners who work with young children? (Please use additional sheets if necessary)

Improvements on current educational provision for under-8s:

Improvements on professional training and development for practitioners who work with young children:

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire.

Would you be available for further discussions/interviews? Yes [ ]1 No [ ]2

Please return the questionnaire to:

Dr Nora Y L Yue
Early Childhood Education Research Centre
Faculty of Education
Goldsmiths' College
University of London
New Cross, London SE14 6NW

Appendix F

Standard Guidelines for Structured Interviews

GOLDSMITHS' COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Early Childhood Education Research Project

"Principles into Practice"

Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning

INTRODUCTORY EXPLANATION : We wish to reassure you the starred (*) questions which require detailed answers can be answered more fully on our separate document which can be filled in at your leisure.

INTERVIEW FOR HEAD OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION OR GROUP, AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS

1 Name of Interviewer and Name of Interviewee, Time, Date, Place.

2 Name and Address of Educational Institution or Group

3 What is the Financial Status of Your Institution: Independent, Voluntary, Local Authority, Funded by Employer, etc.?

***4 The children Under-8 on Roll**

A What are your numbers, including any part-time, approximately?

B What are the ages of the under-8s catered for?

C How many other languages are spoken by the children in your institution?

D What are your policies and approaches to children with Special Needs? [If interviewee requests definition of SN] In your institution how do you identify children with Special Needs, apart from those formally designated so for you?

E Do most of the children travel for more or less than 30 minutes from home?

If appropriate:

F How are the children organised, are they in groups based on age or any other form of grouping? What size are the groups?

G What kind of work are parents involved in?

*5 Staffing

A What is the staff/child ratio?

B What are the different roles of staff, i.e. teacher, nursery worker, cook, etc.?

C What are the qualifications of staff, e.g. courses and qualifications such as BEd., PGCE, QTS, GCSE, City and Guilds, Nursing Diplomas, NVQs, etc.?

D How do staff work, i.e. in teams, singly, etc.?

6 The Premises

A Who owns or provides the premises [e.g. employer, education authority, council, church, hospital, etc.]?

B Who maintains the premises?

C Brief description of surroundings [i.e. city centre, industrial estate, suburbs]

D Number and size of rooms available.

E How do you use the rooms, e.g. classroom, parent's room, cloakroom, playroom, staff room, extended day provision, etc.?

F Outdoor playspace, resources and fixed equipment [e.g. playground, field, garden].

7 Aims of the Educational Institution or Group

Either

A(i) Do you have a printed statement for parents about what you intend the curriculum to be?

Or

A(ii) What are the main features of your prospectus and how were they decided upon?

B Do you have a printed statement or statements about what the curriculum should be for the use of staff?

If appropriate:

C If employer-funded, do you have a statement of your aims for your employer?

D How are decisions taken about the weekly and daily activities provided?

E Are there any sources of ideas and information that you find helpful in your work with under-8s?

F During the last year has any member of staff participated in further training, In-Service Education, or other professional development and support?

G What do you think is the value of these activities?

8 Records and Assessment

A What records do you keep on individual children?

B What formal assessment do you use with your under-8s?

C Do you keep any other kind of written records?

D How do you record the daily activities provided for individuals and/or groups of children?

9 Parents

A To what extent do you have contact with the parents?

B Do you ever meet parents to discuss their children's progress?

C Do you have any policies on relations with parents or projects involving them?

10 How Would You Describe a Quality Curriculum for Young Children? [A written response would be welcomed.]

Thank you for your help!

Geva Blenkin, Vicky Hurst and Marian Whitehead
Early Childhood Education Research Project: "Principles into Practice"

Appendix G

Press Release

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
Early Childhood Education Research Project:
Principles into Practice

Director **Geva M Blenkin MA**
Deputy Director (School Settings) **Marian Whitehead MA**
Deputy Director (Pre-School Settings) **Victoria Hurst BA**
Direct line 0171 919 7314
Direct fax 0171 919 7313

Goldsmiths
UNIVERSITY
OF LONDON

Press Notice

WORKING WITH YOUNG CHILDREN: NEW FINDINGS

The Early Childhood Education Research Project, *Principles into Practice*, based at Goldsmiths' College, University of London, has now completed the first phase of its three-phase programme.

The project is concerned with improving the quality of care and education for children from birth to eight years of age.

It aims to identify key aspects of professional ability which are crucial to the quality of children's learning; to generate criteria for promoting the development of these abilities; and, to improve professional practice in the early years.

A major survey of practitioners' views conducted in England and Wales during Year One of the project (June 1993 to May 1994) has produced a substantial collection of data.

The initial research findings are as follows:

- The majority of heads of every type of group setting, whether located in the voluntary or independent or state-maintained sector, ranked *"Knowledge of Child Development"* as the single most influential factor in the professional development of practitioners who work with the under-8s.
- *"Knowledge of School Subjects"* was placed relatively low in the ranking of factors that are of significance to the professional development of practitioners, even by the heads of schools for statutory age children, e.g. state-maintained primary and infant schools, and preparatory schools in the private sector.
- Less than one in five practitioners who are working with children under eight years of age in group settings has a first degree. Just over a tenth have no qualifications at all.
- Over two-fifths of teachers who are heads of institutions that cater for young children only hold a Certificate of Education and a quarter of these qualified before 1960 with a *two year* Certificate.
- Only one in four qualified teachers was initially trained specifically for the 3-8 age phase, of which only a third were initially trained for the 3-5 age phase.
- Less than one in six qualified teachers working in the early years has engaged in further study related to Early Childhood Education.
- Most practitioners claimed that a high quality curriculum requires high quality professionally trained practitioners.
- The majority of practitioners express serious concern about the negative effects of a narrow and subject-based curriculum on children's early learning.

NOTES FOR EDITORS

1. Leaflets containing General Information and more of the Initial Findings are available from the ECERP office, Department of Educational Studies, Goldsmiths' College, New Cross, London SE14 6NW (0171 919 7314).

2. A collection of papers on the first phase of the project has been published in *Early Years*, Volume 15, Number 1, Autumn 1994. ISSN 0957-5146. Trentham Books Limited, Westview House, 734 London Road, Oakhill, Stoke-on-Trent ST4 5NP (0782 745567).

3. A report on the first phase, Blenkin, G.M. and Yue, N.Y.L. (1994) *"Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning (Year One: June 1993 - May 1994) Interim Report: March 1994"* is available through online retrieval and CD-ROM on the ERIC database and also in printed form, in the ERIC monthly abstract journals *Resources in Education (RIE)*, and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. Paper or microfiche copies of the report can also be ordered from the ERIC Reproduction Service (EDRS), ERIC/EECE, University of Illinois, 805 West Pennsylvania Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801-4897, USA (Tel: (217) 333-1386, Fax: (217) 333-3767).

....

MEMBERS OF THE RESEARCH TEAM (YEAR ONE)

Director	Ms Geva M Blenkin
Deputy Director *(School Settings)*	Ms Marian Whitehead
Deputy Director *(Pre-School Settings)*	Ms Victoria Hurst
Research Associate	Dr Nora Y L Yue

For further information, please telephone 0171 919 7314

14 February 1995

© ECERP: Principles into Practice, Goldsmiths', London, 1995

Early Childhood Education Research Project

Principles into Practice:

Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning

INTERIM REPORT
YEAR TWO
(June 1994 to May 1995)

G.M. Blenkin, M.R. Whitehead, V.M. Hurst,
J.A. Rose, C. Burgess-Macey and N.Y.L. Yue

February 1995

A Research Project funded by the Esmée Fairbairn Charitable Trust
at Goldsmiths' College, University of London

PS 023138

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1 INTRODUCTION 1-2

1.1 Summary of the Research Project 1
1.2 Aims of the Second Phase of the Research 1
1.3 Activities Undertaken in the Second Phase 2

2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 3-10

2.1 The Case for Adopting Action Research 3
2.2 Key Principles of the Action Research Process 4
2.3 The Action Research Case Studies 4
2.4 Establishing Case Studies in Local Authorities 6
2.5 The Action Research Process 6
  2.5.1 Selecting a Focus for Research 7
  2.5.2 Gathering the Data 7
  2.5.3 The Practitioner's Research Journal 8
  2.5.4 Evaluating the Data 8
  2.5.5 The Role of the Research Partner 8
  2.5.6 Networking 9
2.6 The Development of Structured Interviews 9
2.7 The Computerised Analysis of the Qualitative Data 10

3 ANALYSIS 10

4 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS 10-13

4.1 The Evidence from the Case Studies 10
  4.1.1 The Impact of the Research on Practitioners' Thinking 11
  4.1.2 The Impact of the Research on the Children's Learning 11
  4.1.3 The Impact of the Research on the Practitioners' Professional Development 12
4.2 The Voice of the Practitioner 12

5 FURTHER WORK 13

5.1 Improving Strategies for Dissemination - Pilot Stage 13
5.2 The Project's Contribution to Action Research 13

6 CONCLUSIONS 14

APPENDICES

Appendix A Contract Between the Participants
Appendix B Guidance for Practitioners: Conducting Action Research

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Summary of the Research Project

This Interim Report presents an introduction to the activities of the second phase of the research project, Principles into Practice, which is concerned with improving the quality of children's early learning in schools, nurseries and other group settings. The project is making a significant contribution to the current debate on early years care and education by attempting to develop strategies for improving the quality of provision for children under eight.

During the first phase of the project an extensive survey of current early years provision in England and Wales was undertaken and the views of early years practitioners concerning quality provision were elicited. This research has yielded significant results and has affirmed the claim that the key to achieving quality lies with the practitioners themselves. Many headteachers, for example, cite the qualities of their staff as a critical factor for ensuring quality in practice. The project, therefore, intends to build on the evidence that suggests the role of the practitioner is central and crucial to effective education. This is being achieved by focusing on the professional development of practitioners who are working with young children.

The project has entered its second phase and the intention is to develop strategies which will enable early years practitioners to evaluate their effectiveness in providing quality care and education. This is being achieved by encouraging practitioners to identify and question those principles which inform their practice, with the overall aim of raising the quality of that practice.

1.2 Aims of the Second Phase of the Research

During the second phase of the project the main aims are:

- *To undertake a series of action research case studies in order to explore with practitioners their effectiveness in implementing what they regard as a high quality curriculum.*
- *To evaluate the effectiveness of the action research process as a strategy for promoting professional development.*
- *To generate guidelines for improving the quality of professional practice and training in the early years.*
- *To pilot dissemination strategies in order to evaluate the most effective ways of communicating, with a view to implementation, the research findings and guidelines generated for practice to practitioners, trainers and policy-makers.*

- *To extend the pilot study of structured interviews with heads of institutions in order to elicit their views of quality provision.*

- *To extend the analysis of the qualitative data generated from the first and second phases of the research through the use of innovative computer-assisted qualitative analysis software.*

- *To develop a suitable framework for analysing the extensive narrative data yielded from the case studies, the questionnaire survey and the structured interviews.*

1.3 Activities Undertaken in the Second Phase

The second phase of the research is extending the pilot work undertaken in the first phase. Researchers are collaborating with practitioners in the evaluation of their practice in order to raise its quality. This is being done by involving practitioners in action research which enables them to investigate and critically reflect upon aspects of their practice.

It is anticipated that an analysis of the case studies will yield information that will enable the project to produce guidelines for raising the standards of practitioners' performance. An initial review of the pilot studies carried out in the first phase and the work currently in progress is already providing evidence for the development of strategies for improving the quality of practice.

As part of the analysis of the case study material, there will be an evaluation of the effectiveness of action research itself as a strategy for enhancing professional development, as we test the claims made by advocates of action research.

Collaborative networks have been developed in order to provide a framework of support and to facilitate cooperation. These networks are also expected to play an important role in the dissemination process.

The second phase also incorporates a continuation of the work piloted in the first phase by interviewing various heads of institutions involved in the case studies in order to explore in depth issues of quality. This source of data is intended to complement the evidence derived from the survey questionnaire.

The data yielded by the action research studies and the structured interviews will require a special kind of narrative analysis. In addition to the computerised analysis of qualitative data, it is intended to provide an effective framework within which to evaluate this important evidence.

2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There are three kinds of research activities being undertaken in the second phase of the project. These are:

- action research case studies
- structured interviews
- a computerised analysis of qualitative data

2.1 The Case for Adopting Action Research

Action research has been adopted because its advocates claim that it is the most effective means by which practitioners may improve the quality of their practice. It is offered as a process by which practitioners can develop themselves professionally and improve their ability to raise the quality of their practice. An investigation into the literature on action research has enabled the project team to identify the key reasons given for why action research is the most effective way of enhancing professional development. One of the main exercises of this project is to put these claims to the test. The team is examining, therefore, whether these claims, which are listed below, are justified.

- Action research is critical, self-evaluative enquiry that stimulates practitioners to consider the context of their practice and to articulate the underlying values and assumptions that inform and influence practice. It enables practitioners to question aspects of their practice and to consider the effectiveness of their professional actions and judgments, along with the impact these have on the children with whom they work.

- Action research requires practitioners to look more closely at their practice, beyond the daily reflections and assessments that already play a part. Through action research, reflection becomes a more deliberate and conscious process giving the reflections a practical agenda with structure, strength and purpose.

- Action research enables practitioners to make closer observations of their practice, thus helping them to deepen their understanding of children's learning. This then enables them to make better evaluations and more appropriate decisions about learning. And this in turn improves the quality of their provision for children's early learning.

- Action research not only helps practitioners to understand their practice more deeply but also helps them to transform it. Since these changes are self initiated, the impact is likely to have more real effect.

- Action research acknowledges the complexity, unpredictability and ambiguities of educational practice. It is a flexible and adaptable process that accommodates itself to the particular needs and circumstances of practitioners and their practice.

- Action research re-enthuses and re-empowers practitioners and it encourages them to take fulfilment from, and control of, their practice.

- Action research differs from traditional research in that practitioners play a key role at every level, and this ensures that the benefits are both direct and meaningful.

- Action research closes the gap between theory and practice through its continuous cycle of thought and action.

2.2 Key Principles of the Action Research Process

There are two key principles inherent in the process of action research which this project will uphold. These are:

(i) ***Firstly, that each practitioner should participate in the action research phase of the project without any obligation.*** It is understood and agreed that the supporting local authorities will not put pressure on the institutions to become involved at this stage, and that it is the practitioners who must be in control of the action research within their institutions;

(ii) ***Secondly, that the action research process precludes the imposition of any formal and rigid structure or programme.*** Experience has shown that practitioners are seldom effective in improving the quality of their practice under these circumstances. The project, therefore, seeks to provide only a framework of guidelines that will ensure flexibility and empowerment for the practitioner.

2.3 The Action Research Case Studies

The work undertaken in the pilot studies of action research demonstrated the labour-intensive nature of the work. They also showed that it was necessary to continue to have full representation of a range of types of practitioners and settings if the recommendations are to have real impact. In order to represent the wide range of early years settings, therefore, it was necessary to gain the support of local authorities who are complementing the work already being undertaken with the help of the Trust funding.

Action research case studies are now being established as follows:

- With practitioners from institutions in the state-maintained sector who were involved in the pilot study and who are continuing their research during phase two

- With practitioners from institutions in the independent and the voluntary sectors, some of whom are continuing their work begun in the pilot study and others who are beginning their research in phase two

- With practitioners and institutions from those local authorities who are supporting phase two of the research

The supporting local authorities have committed themselves to both the research and dissemination aspects of the project and their involvement is an affirmation of the importance of the work being undertaken by this project and a recognition of the value of quality in children's early learning. Each of the authorities have particular concerns and have given the project directives as detailed in Table 1.

Local Authorities	Directives
London Borough of Croydon London Borough of Hillingdon Hertfordshire County Council	*To work with practitioners in Nursery Schools and Classes*
London Borough of Lambeth	*To work with practitioners in all types of provision made by the local authority for children under eight, including some settings, such as playgroups, which are located in the voluntary sector but are supported by the authority*
London Borough of Lewisham London Borough of Southwark	*To work with practitioners in schools and other local authority group provision for the under 5s*
London Borough of Hounslow	*The directive is currently under negotiation*

Table 1: Local Authority Directives

The number of local authorities participating is likely to increase. We are currently anticipating that we will be working with up to 100 institutions. Together with practitioners from the pilot study, the project team will be working with a wide range of personnel including:

Classroom Assistants
Headteachers
Nursery Nurses
Nursery Officers
Playgroup Assistants
Playgroup Leaders
Support staff
Teachers

2.4 Establishing Case Studies in Local Authorities

The following describes the procedure for establishing action research within the supporting local authorities. This involves adopting a similar procedure to that followed in the pilot studies. Each institution has a linked Director and Research Associate. Although the project requires at least one named action researcher, other staff are encouraged to participate in the research. The procedure is as follows:

(i) The supporting local authorities select the institutions and practitioners who will undertake the project's work. This involves the naming of two to five institutions per local authority in the first instance. This number increases during the course of the year. The Project Director, usually accompanied by the Research Associate, then makes an initial visit to each institution. If possible, both the head of the institution and the named action researcher attend this meeting. During the meeting, the aims and nature of the project are explained and the role of the institution in the research is clarified. It is clearly stated that participation is voluntary and it is suggested that the staff in the institution spend several days considering the proposal.

(ii) The Director also makes an arrangement to conduct a structured interview with the head to obtain further information about the institution's provision for its young children and to elicit the head's views of a quality curriculum for early years. During this second visit the Director arranges for a contract to be signed between the institution and the project. This contract outlines the participants' rights, obligations and responsibilities and includes a confidentiality agreement. A copy of the contract is provided in Appendix A.

(iii) Hereafter, the main communication channel is between the research partner, who is the Research Associate from the project, and the action researcher(s). During the first visit the research partner provides any further details and initiates the action research process. The project is initially providing extensive support for these practitioners with visits every two weeks for the first term. Thereafter, the support is increasingly withdrawn to enable the practitioner to operate independently. There will, however, be some form of contact retained with each practitioner throughout the year. Details of the ways in which the research partner supports the practitioner are provided in section 2.5.5.

2.5 The Action Research Process

The project team has produced a leaflet entitled Guidance for Practitioners: Conducting Action Research. A copy of this leaflet is provided in Appendix B. Practitioners are given this leaflet as an initial guideline for their research. The process is detailed as follows:

2.5.1 Selecting a Focus for Research

Practitioners select their own curriculum issue to investigate and reflect upon. These are specifically chosen by practitioners since they are most able to judge which area of their practice would be an appropriate focus for investigation. Although each issue is different, all have been selected as examples that illustrate the important link between principles and practice. Examples of areas under investigation from the early stages of the research include:

Managing staff contact with children

The role of the adult in children's early reading development

The effectiveness of planning for target children

The outdoor learning environment

Storytelling and language development

Supporting bilingual learners

The role of the teacher as an evaluator

Early representation and cognitive development

In considering the area to investigate, practitioners think about:

- How the examination of this selected area may improve the quality of their practice
- What they wish to achieve by the inquiry
- The current context of the area being researched

2.5.2 Gathering the Data

Once the practitioners have chosen their area of focus, they select from a wide variety of data gathering strategies. These are chosen for their value in helping practitioners discover more about their chosen focus. Strategies include:

Observations (various formats)
Audio recordings
Video recordings
Photographs
Interviews
Questionnaires
Documentation

2.5.3 The Practitioner's Research Journal

Most of the practitioners also undertake to record their personal reflections, ideas and other observations in a research journal. This becomes an important companion to the research process and acts as a record of their self understanding. This is also an important resource for the project, since it can help in the evaluation of the impact of action research on a practitioner's thinking and practice.

2.5.4 Evaluating the Research

Evaluation is an ongoing process in the action research and does not simply occur at the end of the case study. In reflecting on the data, practitioners are encouraged to consider the following issues:

- Whether the data are providing new insights into their practice
- Whether these insights are leading to changes in their practice
- Whether these changes are leading to an improvement in the quality of their practice
- Whether these changes are having any impact on the children's learning

The practitioners are also being asked to reflect on the wider context of the research and to evaluate the action research process itself. They are, therefore, being asked to examine:

- Any factors that may be helping or hindering the process of carrying out the research
- The contribution of the research partner

2.5.5 The Role of the Research Partner

The research partners are supporting the practitioners' action research in a variety of ways:

- In offering ideas and helping with the practicalities of the data gathering process
- By assisting the critical reflection process, including sharing and discussing the research
- With data collection and evaluation
- Through the arrangement of network meetings with other action researchers
- With the publication of findings

2.5.6 Networking

The pilot studies confirmed the belief that collaborative networking is an important part of the action research process. Networking is fulfilling a number of needs:

- It is enabling the action researchers to come together to share and discuss their work. All the practitioners have expressed interest in hearing about the work being done in other institutions.
- It is providing a necessary psychological support for the practitioners. Many practitioners have commented on the way in which networking provides them with a stronger sense of purpose and community.
- It is providing a framework for dissemination and offering opportunities for practitioners to communicate findings about children's learning and about successful practice.

Networks are being established within each local authority with several meetings being arranged between the practitioners. Sometimes these meetings are in association with the project staff and at other times they occur independently.

The project also provides an overall network system through the arrangement of termly meetings for all participating action researchers. This is to provide an opportunity for practitioners to meet other action researchers from different areas and to give them an overall perspective on the project.

To strengthen the networking process further, the project is also producing a monthly newsletter to be sent to all participating action researchers. This will contain news and information about the project. The first of these is currently in production.

2.6 The Development of Structured Interviews

The development of structured interviews, which began in the first phase, is being extended in the second phase. This dimension of the research is conducted by members of the team who are interviewing the heads of every institution participating in the action research case studies. These interviews, which are audiotaped, are all conducted in accordance with agreed standard guidelines. The interview has been framed to complement relevant questions on the survey questionnaire.

The texts of the interviews are transcribed and a narrative analysis is being undertaken of the comments issued regarding quality provision for the early years. These will be compared with the responses to the survey which took place during the first phase of the project.

2.7 The Computerised Analysis of the Qualitative Data

Innovative computer-assisted qualitative analysis software has been acquired to perform an extended evaluation of the qualitative data generated from the first and second phases of the research. This program, NUD.IST (***N***on-numerical ***U***nstructured ***D***ata ***I***ndexing ***S***earching and ***T***heorizing), is designed to aid the handling of non-numerical and unstructured material in the analysis of qualitative data, thus enabling a more thorough and manageable analysis of the substantial body of qualitative data generated by the project.

3 ANALYSIS

The second phase aims to yield the following:

- **An analysis of the action research case studies in order to generate guidelines for promoting quality practice;**
- **An analysis of the qualitative data yielded from the structured interviews and the survey, using both computerised and narrative techniques in order to identify aspects of quality provision;**
- **An evaluation of the action research process in order to assess its success as a strategy for professional development;**
- **An evaluation of the pilot dissemination activities in order to inform phase three of the project's work.**

4 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Since much of the data for the second phase are still emerging, it is only possible to make a preliminary report. Most of the evidence currently available arises from the action research case studies, and it is from this area of the research that we can report some initial findings.

4.1. The Evidence from the Case Studies

The qualitative data being produced from the action research studies is revealing what is actually happening in early years practice by showing the ways in which practitioners approach children and their learning. The analysis of this data is still in its formative stage. It is, however, already possible to discern some key elements from the current case study material and from the evidence from the pilot studies. These are indicating the ways in which the action research process is contributing to the professional development of the practitioners and to an improvement in the quality of their practice.

Since the case studies are, at present, yielding data that are largely of a narrative kind, the initial findings are presented in the form of key points that suggest the different ways in which the action research is impacting upon the practitioners and their practice. These key points have been arranged into three main categories, although the interrelation between these categories is acknowledged. For example, the impact of the research on the practitioners' thinking directly influences any impact on the children's learning.

4.1.1 The Impact of the Research on Practitioners' Thinking

- For many of the practitioners, the research is raising new issues and leading to different explanations of what is going on in their practice. It is constantly creating new questions and revealing new insights into children's learning.

- For some the research is raising more questions than answers, but these questions are opening up new horizons and are causing the practitioners to deepen their professional understanding.

- Some are conscious of an advance in their thinking so that it develops beyond a mere concern with management issues, and are making consequent changes to their practice.

- The research is undoubtedly helping practitioners to review their assumptions, thereby deepening their understanding of their decision-making process.

4.1.2 The Impact of the Research on the Children's Learning

- The research is enabling practitioners to realise more clearly what is happening in their practice. All the practitioners are commenting on the way in which it helps them to *focus* more on their work with children.

- Many of the observations have led practitioners to new discoveries about children's learning and to a re-evaluation of appropriate practice.

- For others it is sometimes difficult to identify a direct improvement in the children's learning, but many practitioners confidently claim that the deepening understanding of children cannot fail to be having an effect, however subtle this may be.

- For some it is confirming or stimulating the need to use close observation as a diagnostic tool and to become more analytical about the quality of what children do.

- In some cases, it is having an impact on the parents and enabling the parents to come to a better understanding of their children's learning.

4.1.3 The Impact of the Research on the Practitioners' Professional Development

- For many the research is helping to rekindle an interest in children's learning.

- The research makes some feel more accountable for what they are doing and more able to justify and explain it.

- The research is often providing the practitioners with a forum for educational debate as they discuss fundamental aspects of children's learning and their influence on these. It is also providing them with opportunities to share and help each other with particular problems.

- It is also making many of the staff aware of the relevance of research and its applicability to their own practice, rather than seeing research as something that is undertaken by university personnel and therefore of no consequence to them.

- The level of involvement of other members of staff varies according to the type of setting. But most of the studies are leading other members of staff to take on a critical and supportive interest in the research. In this way, the research is providing a focus for professional collaboration and for raising debates about what is actually happening in the setting and the value of it.

- The research is sometimes a painful process in which the practitioners are having to acknowledge that they may have *'got it wrong'*. It sometimes provokes self-doubt, but the long term benefits are helping the practitioners in quite specific ways.

As the case studies yield more evidence for each of these categories, the extensive material will be analysed using both computerised techniques, such as the NUD.IST software, and the frameworks developed for analysing narrative data.

4.2 The Voice of the Practitioner

The evidence for these findings is gathered directly from the practitioners themselves. This preserves the practitioners' voice, which is significant because it ensures that the practitioners' perspective is valued. They are therefore more likely to improve and develop their practice. The following are examples of the practitioners' voice:

> *"I would hope that my increased insight has improved the quality of interaction the children have with me."* (Reception Teacher, Infant school)
>
> *"The research helps you focus in more sharply."* (Nursery Teacher, Nursery School)
>
> *"It has helped me to discover beliefs I had about how to do certain things that I took for granted and would not have questioned before."* (Reception Teacher, Infant School)

> *"Action research is good because over the years, again and again, we have been saying: 'when are they going to actually ask the people who're doing it?'."* (Nursery Nurse, Day Nursery)
>
> *"The research has made me think on a higher level - since I have been teaching I have been bogged down in the practicalities of teaching."* (Reception Teacher, Infant School)
>
> *"The research helps you look at the children in a different way."* (Nursery Teacher, Nursery School)
>
> *"The rest of the staff have already picked up some things that I was doing."* (Nursery Teacher, Nursery Class)

A further advantage of producing evidence which preserves the voice of the practitioner is that it provides authentic accounts of practitioners' experiences. Such evidence is likely to encourage other practitioners to accept and implement the guidelines and recommendations for improving practice developed by the research. This will facilitate the dissemination process as it attempts, in real terms, to improve the quality of children's learning.

5 FURTHER WORK

5.1 Improving Strategies for Dissemination - Pilot Stage

In the first phase of the project, various traditional dissemination activities were undertaken. These largely involved the communication of findings through established agencies. During the second phase of the project we will be piloting different procedures for the **implementation** of these findings. This will require more sophisticated approaches than those which are adopted in order to disseminate mere information.

The second phase will continue to inform various audiences of the research findings through presentations, information leaflets, conferences and publications. However, it will also begin to pilot strategies for implementing the guidelines that are developed from the research and are directed at improving the quality of practice. These will include inservice training, guidance leaflets and other materials for distance learning. The experiences gained from these activities will be evaluated in order to inform the development of strategies when dissemination becomes the main focus during the final phase of the project.

5.2 The Project's Contribution to Action Research

In addition to the extensive empirical evidence which will clarify the potential of action research as an effective device for professional development, this project aims to make a unique contribution to the work being done in the field of action research.

During the early part of phase two, an extensive review of the literature on action research was undertaken. And this has revealed a paucity of accounts of action research conducted by practitioners who are working with children in early years settings. This project, therefore, will make a substantial contribution to this area.

Furthermore, most action research that has been conducted to promote children's learning, has been undertaken by members of the teaching profession. This project is working with a range of personnel, many of whom are not trained teachers. As a result, we are beginning to provide significant insights into the ways in which action research can facilitate the professional development of both teaching and non-teaching personnel.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This Interim Report has begun to demonstrate the contribution that action research has made in relation to both professional development and the understanding of how children learn most effectively in group settings. Through action research we are able to see more clearly and realistically the issues that affect development and change in professional practice. The development of competency involves active learning. In conducting action research, practitioners are always learning and devising new ways in which to improve the quality of their practice.

The Final Report of phase two will provide a full analysis of the growing evidence which is emerging from these case studies. In doing so, it will provide an informed evaluation of the success of action research as a device for promoting professional development in the early years. In this way, effective guidelines for practitioners will be produced to enable quality in practice to become a reality.

Appendix A

Contract Between the Participants

Goldsmiths' College, University of London
Department of Educational Studies

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION RESEARCH PROJECT
Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning

CONTRACT BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS

This project aims to investigate how practitioners working together can provide a quality curriculum for young children (0-8). It is hoped that all participants in the research process will feel able to make a contribution.

1. **The participants:**
   These will be members of the research team from Goldsmiths' College, mainly Geva Blenkin, Vicky Hurst and Marian Whitehead, and members of staff of the educational institutions or groups.

2. **What participants will do:**
   a) Research participants will contribute observations and other material to the research.
   b) Practitioner participants will attend occasional meetings to discuss progress in the research and future developments.
   c) Opportunities will be available for practitioners to be involved in action research.

3. **Commitments of participants:**
   Participants will be expected to continue the research for the duration of the project (Possibly three years).

4. **Rights of participants:**
   Participants will have a right to be consulted about any publication or public presentation resulting from the research, whether this is by the team from Goldsmiths' College or by members of the educational institutions or groups.

5. **Confidentiality:**
   Participants will maintain confidentiality. No individual will be identified in any reporting of the research, whether written or verbal, without prior agreement. No child will be observed without the consent of the parents and/or head of the educational institution or group.

Signed	Signed
for Goldsmiths' College Early Childhood Education Research Project Principles into Practice	for Educational Institution or Group
	....
....	....
Date	Date.....................

Appendix B

Guidance for Practitioners: Conducting Action Research

Early Childhood Education
Research Project

ECERP

Principles into Practice: Improving the Quality of Children's Early Learning

Phase II
Action Research Studies

GUIDANCE FOR PRACTITIONERS

Leaflet A:
CONDUCTING ACTION RESEARCH

A Research Project at Goldsmiths' College
University of London

WHAT IS ACTION RESEARCH?

- It is research undertaken by you the practitioner to investigate your own practice.

- It can improve the quality of your practice by:

    - enabling you to deepen your understanding of children's learning,

    - enabling you to develop a more critically reflective approach to your practice.

- In this Project many practitioners are evaluating their own effectiveness in providing quality care and education for young children and identifying and questioning principles which support their practice.

THE PROCESS OF ACTION RESEARCH

Selecting Your Focus

In deciding what area of practice to investigate, consider the following:

- The focus can incorporate any issue but should relate to some aspect of Early Years practice you believe is significant in your own practice.

- It may be an area of interest, an area you wish to develop, or an area in which you wish to deepen your understanding.

- It is important that the issue is relevant to you and manageable within the context of your practice.

Think about:

- Why you wish to investigate this area,
- How the area to be investigated may improve the quality of your practice,
- If there is anything you particularly wish to find out or achieve,
- Your views of the current context of the area being investigated.

Remember:

- Action research is an ongoing process of forming hypotheses and initiating action and critical reflection, with new questions being asked continually.
- Action research is also a process of self evaluation since it enables you to examine the underlying values that inform your practice and to consider the effectiveness of your professional actions.

Gathering the Data

There is a wide variety of data gathering strategies you may wish to adopt:

- Observations (various formats)
- Audio recordings
- Video recordings
- Photographs
- Interviews
- Questionnaires
- Documentation
- The research journal. This is essentially a record of self-understanding and is an important companion to the action research process. It is a personal notebook containing ideas, observations and reflections about the research.

In choosing different methods, be aware that your data will represent events selectively.

Evaluating Your Research

In reflecting on the data, consider the following:

- Did the data provide any new insights into your practice?
- Did these insights lead to any changes in your educational practice?
- Did these changes result in an improvement in the quality of your educational practice?
- Did this have any impact on the learning of your children?
- Did these insights provide the basis for further questions/inquiry?
- What role did your research partner play in these developments?
- Were there any factors that hindered the research process?

THE ROLE OF YOUR RESEARCH PARTNER

Your research partner can help:

- With ideas and the practicalities of the data gathering process,
- With the critical reflection process, including sharing and discussing your work,
- With data collection and evaluation,
- With networking with other practitioners through local and cross-borough meetings,
- With publication of findings.

Networking and meeting other practitioners to share and discuss the work is an integral part of the action research process.

If you would like further information, please contact the Project Secretary, direct line: 0171 919 7314, direct fax: 0171 919 7313.

We welcome anyone wishing to contribute to the project.

© *ECERP: Principles into Practice, Goldsmiths', London, February 1995.*